

तमसो मा ज्योतिर्गमय

SANTINIKETAN
VISHVA BHARATI
LIBRARY

922.76

S15 T24

V.2

Frederick Temple
Archbishop of Canterbury





J. E. Howe 1885

Memoirs of Archbishop Temple

BY
SEVEN FRIENDS

EDITED BY
E. G. SANDFORD

ARCHDEACON OF EXETER

WITH PHOTOGRAPHURE AND OTHER ILLUSTRATIONS

IN TWO VOLUMES

VOL. II

London
MACMILLAN AND CO., LIMITED
NEW YORK : THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

1906

All rights reserved

First Edition, February 1906.

Reprinted, March 1906.

CONTENTS

LONDON MEMOIR, 1885-1896

By The Venerable H. E. J. BEVAN, M.A., Archdeacon of Middlesex,
 Prebendary of St. Paul's, and Rector of Chelsea

CHAPTER I

BREAKING GROUND IN LONDON

	PAGE
Bishop Jackson's death and episcopate—Enthronement and earliest functions—Election of rural deans—Primary con- ference of the London clergy and laity—Relations with the London clergy	23

CHAPTER II

• DIOCESAN ORGANISATION

Suffragan Bishops—East London and Bishop Walsham How— Parochial organisation—Relations of Suffragans and Arch- deacons with the Bishop—Patronage—Lay work—Deacon- esses—Diocesan Church Reading Union	23
--	----

CHAPTER III

CONFERENCES, LECTURES AND ADDRESSES

Baptism—Holy Orders—History and practice of the Church of England—Conduct of Church services—Sermons—Know- ledge of the Bible—Relation of the Church to the poor in England—Statistics—The Lincoln judgment—Ritual—
--

	PAGE
Foreign missions—Scepticism and indifference—The observance of Sunday—Evolution (address at the Shrewsbury Church Congress)—The study of Church history—Faith (an address at Sion College)	47

CHAPTER IV

EDUCATIONAL WORK IN LONDON

Teaching University for London—King's College—Elementary education—Religious teaching—Home influence—The religious character of the teacher—Use and abuse of tests—Church schools—The clergyman in the schools—Educational measures—The Bible—The proposed Gresham University	73
---	----

CHAPTER V

QUESTIONS OF RITUAL AND DOCTRINE

Ecclesiastical prosecutions—Confession—Commemoration of the dead—The Church Association—Unauthorised forms of service—The re-marriage of divorced persons—The Episcopal veto—St. Paul's reredos—Dr. Momerie's case—Relations with Nonconformists	100
--	-----

CHAPTER VI

SOCIAL PROBLEMS

The Anti-Sweating League—The unemployed—Poor relief—Social purity—Church and Stage Guild—The relation of the clergy to party politics—The temperance question—The Dockers' Strike, 1889—Bishop's Park, Fulham	123
---	-----

CHAPTER VII

BISHOP TEMPLE'S WORK IN CONVOCATION, 1885-1896

Royal Commission on Housing of the Working Classes—Polygamy in heathen lands—Report on the functions of Queen Anne's Bounty Office—The unpaid diaconate—Relations with Lower House—Marriage Act Amendment Act—Betting and Gamb-

CONTENTS

vii

PAGE:

ling—Thanks of Convocation in connexion with the Education Bill of 1890—Mission to Convocation of York—Interpretation of the Act of Uniformity Amendment Act—Church Patronage Bill, 1893—Working of the Conscience Clause in schools—Report of Joint Committee on Secondary Education—Obituary notices in Convocation	153
---	-----

CHAPTER VIII

LONDON'S APPRECIATION OF A GREAT EPISCOPATE

Presentation of pastoral staff—Proposed disestablishment of the Church in Wales—Church endowments—The Log of the <i>Mayflower</i> —Dr. Temple as an Administrator—Confirmations—Translation to Canterbury and farewell presentations—Relations with fellow-labourers	165
Appendix A—The Proposed Gresham University	196
Appendix B—The Gresham University Charter	198
Appendix C—Religious Endowments	204

CANTERBURY MEMOIR, 1896-1902

By The Venerable H. M. SPOONER, M.A., Archdeacon of Maidstone, Canon of Canterbury

Reception at Canterbury—Sale of Addington Park and rebuilding of the Old Palace, Canterbury—Consecration of the chapel—Reception in the Old Palace of the boys of the Cathedral choir—Sessions of the Diocesan Conference—Temperance—Education—Foreign Missions—Diocesan visits—Home at Canterbury—King's School, Canterbury—Citizenship—The last year: final visitation, meetings, and sermon—The last days	209
--	-----

THE PRIMACY, 1896-1902

By The Right Rev. GEORGE FORREST BROWNE, D.D.,
Bishop of Bristol

CHAPTER I

THE BEGINNING

Death of Dr. Benson—The appointment of Dr. Temple—Relations between the two friends—Dr. Temple as Archbishop	245
--	-----

CHAPTER II

THE ENTHRONEMENT, ADDINGTON, ETC.

	PAGE
The Confirmation—The day of Enthronement—The Bull <i>Apostolicæ Curæ</i> and the <i>Responsio</i> —The sale of Addington—The Old Palace at Canterbury—Costly repairs at Lambeth—Transfer of the Playing Fields at Lambeth to the care of the County Council	253

CHAPTER III

THE LAMBETH CONFERENCE

Queen Victoria's Diamond Jubilee—The Fourth Lambeth Conference, 1897—Ebbs Fleet—Arrangements for the sessions at Lambeth Palace—Archbishop Temple's conduct of the Conference—The Encyclical Letter—The Service of Dismissal in St. Paul's—Meeting at Glastonbury	267
---	-----

CHAPTER IV

OFFICIAL VISITS TO SCOTLAND

Visit to the General Assembly (1898)—Temperance reception—Attendance at the annual meeting of the Scottish Threefold Option Alliance in the Masonic Hall—Visit to Perth and the Episcopal Church in Scotland (1902)	281
---	-----

CHAPTER V

CONTROVERSY

Primary Visitation Charge, 1898—Questions of ritual, and doctrine, and discipline—The opinion of the Archbishops on incense—Lay deputation of protest—The Archbishop's opinion on the reservation of the Blessed Sacrament	290
--	-----

CONTENTS

ix

CHAPTER VI

VARIOUS VISITS AND ADDRESSES

	PAGE
Church Congresses—Nottingham—Bradford—London—Newcastle—Brighton—Church Endowments—Welsh Church—Reading the Bible—Hostels—The study of language—Visits to Bristol—Hereford—Norwich—Wakefield—Salisbury—Cambridge University	309

CHAPTER VII

CONVOCATION

Reception as Archbishop—Reform of Convocation—Hearing of cases of doubt—Benefices Bill—Unauthorised services—Parochial Councils—Revised Version—Sunday newspapers—Reform of Ecclesiastical Courts—Voluntary schools, 1900—Candidates for Holy Orders—Dilapidations—Royal Warrant—Marriage with a deceased wife's sister—Obituary notice in Convocation	325
--	-----

CHAPTER VIII

THE HOUSE OF LORDS

Contagious diseases—A Sunday Bill—Suffragan Bishops Bill—Education—Benefices Bill—Irregularities in public worship—Prayer for the dead—Temperance—Marriage Act Amendment Bill—Burial Bill—The Sovereign's declaration—Factory and workshops	345
---	-----

CHAPTER IX

QUEEN VICTORIA AND KING EDWARD VII

Sermon on the Queen's eightieth birthday at St. Paul's—Death of Queen Victoria—Speech in the House of Lords—Sermon in St. Paul's—St. Botolph's—Croydon—The Coronation of King Edward VII	365
--	-----

CONTENTS

CHAPTER X

THE END

	PAGE
Last engagements—Last speech in the House of Lords—Communication to the House of Lords by the Bishop of Winchester—The end—The funeral—The grave	375
Appendix. By the Bishop of Salisbury	388

EDITOR'S SUPPLEMENT

CHAPTER I

DEVELOPMENT

Character illustrated from correspondence—Schooldays—Introduction to Oxford—Dr. Jenkyns—Formation of friendships—Growth, political, philosophical, literary—Work for Ireland Scholarship and Degree—Final result—First impressions of the Oxford Movement—Ward—Newman—Pusey—Attraction and repulsion—Death of a College acquaintance—Growth of controversy—Temple's perplexity—Devotional study and practical religious duties—Tract XC.—Bishop Selwyn and Dr. Arnold at Oxford—Death of Dr. Arnold and offer by Dr. Tait of a Rugby Mastership—Balliol tutorship—Increasing influence upon Temple of the Oxford Movement—Mr. Jelf's letter to Mrs. Temple—Crisis of mental anxiety—Correspondence between son and mother—Ward's deprivation and final secession—Consequent reaction on Temple's mind—Expansion of liberal view—Mental settlement and ordination—Summary as to permanent influence of the Oxford Movement on Temple's mind	401
--	-----

CHAPTER II

DISCIPLINE

Choice of future line of life—Education Office and Kneller Hall—Hopes on leaving Oxford—Incidental interests: Theological, educational, political; illustrated by correspondence with Scott and Lawson—University Reform and Oxford Local Examinations—Cause of failure of Kneller Hall, atti-
--

CONTENTS

xi

PAGE

tude of the clergy (Coleridge correspondence), attitude of the Government (Scott correspondence)—Resignation of Principalship—Depression under sense of failure—Influence of official life and experience of Kneller Hall on character .	483
--	-----

CHAPTER III

POWER

Appointment to Rugby, the opportunity of Temple's life—The School's expectation—Temple's response—Temple in the fulness of his powers—Death of his mother and brother— <i>Essays and Reviews</i> —Hayman episode	588
--	-----

CHAPTER IV

RESPONSIBILITY

Responsibility, a check and inspiration—in theology (Bampton Lectures)—in ecclesiastical and educational policy and attitude—Stability and restfulness	628
--	-----

CHAPTER V

THE COMPLETED LIFE

The care of the Faith, the Church, National life—Matured character, his chief offering to the Church and Nation—Home life in old age, correspondence with his son—Humour and pregnant sayings—Deepening sympathy—Daily service in Canterbury Cathedral— <i>Nunc Dimittis</i>	656
--	-----

INDEX	713
-----------------	-----

ILLUSTRATIONS

PHOTOGRAVURE PLATES

The Bishop	.	<i>Frontispiece</i>
The Silver Wedding Photograph	.	<i>To face page 216</i>
The Archbishop in his Coronation Robes	.	245

OTHER ILLUSTRATIONS

The Old Palace and Canterbury Cathedral	.	<i>To face page 209</i>
The Archbishop, from the Cartoon for the Memorial Window in Exeter Cathedral	.	401
The Memorial at Canterbury Cathedral	.	712

CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE

- Nov. 30, 1821. Birth of Frederick Temple.
1834. Entrance at Blundell's School.
1839. Commencement of Residence at Balliol.
1842. Double First Class.
1846. Ordained Deacon by Bishop Wilberforce.
1848. Examiner in the Education Office.
1850. Principal of Kneller Hall.
1855. H.M. Inspector of Training Schools.
1858. Headmaster of Rugby.
1860. Publication of *Essays and Reviews*.
1869. Consecration as Bishop of Exeter.
1885. Bishop of London.
1896. Archbishop of Canterbury.
- Dec. 23, 1902. Death.

LONDON MEMOIR

1885—1896

•
**By The Venerable H. E. J. BEVAN, M.A., Archdeacon of
Middlesex, Prebendary of St. Paul's, and Rector of Chelsea**

CHAPTER I

BREAKING GROUND IN LONDON

Bishop Jackson's death and episcopate—Enthronement and earliest functions—Election of rural deans—Primary conference of the London clergy and laity—Relations with the London clergy.

ON the Feast of the Epiphany, 1885, Bishop Jackson died, after an episcopate in London of sixteen years. Two days before, he had preached his last sermon at St. Paul's; then there was one warning day at Fulham, at the close of which (to use Dean Church's words) "he lay down to sleep and slept into the Unseen World," *felix opportunitate mortis*; one of the most earnest wishes of his heart having been that he might "be saved from being a cumberer of the ground." Greater as an administrator than as an originator, no prelate had lived more earnestly for his diocese or had a more thorough knowledge of its requirements. Many as are the qualities which go to make a successful Bishop of London, they were almost all, in the then present condition of ecclesiastical politics, subordinate to a settled determination to promote the peace of the Church.¹ The extent of Bishop Jackson's power in this

¹ For this and other observations on the episcopate of Dr. Jackson and the appointment of Dr. Temple to the See of London, I am indebted to the writers of contemporary articles in the *Guardian*.—H. E. J. B.

direction may be gathered from the tranquillity which resulted from his judicious rule. The policy which—following the counsels of his predecessor, Archbishop Tait—he was led to adopt in the closing years of his life, conciliated the goodwill of those who might have been tempted to regard him as unsympathetic; and the touching words with which he concluded his last address to the clergy of the diocese on the occasion of his fourth Visitation, November 7, 1884, long lingered in the ears of those who heard them:—

Oh, brethren! when the shades of closing life are falling, and it is idle to dream of compensating for the faults of the past by resolutions for the future, the mind is forced back on a retrospect where there is mostly a humiliating array of errors and imperfections, opportunities missed, resolves broken, mistakes made, useful plans marred in their execution, and a stewardship which, if not faithless, is yet felt to have greatly failed. In such a retrospect, amidst so much to humble and to grieve, it would be to me a source of unspeakable comfort if, when the burden has to be laid aside and the work is over, I might be permitted to believe that at least I had left my diocese in unity and peace.

It is no disparagement of Bishop Jackson to say that he was firm rather than strong, and that the years of his episcopate left his successor much to originate. There were whole fields of work in which the invigorating and fertilising touch of a bishop's hand needed to be felt through every fibre and root of the vineyard. And the man best fitted for the work was, in God's providence, selected to do it. On Friday, January 30, it was announced that the Bishop of Exeter had been nominated by Mr. Gladstone to the See of London, in succession to Dr. Jackson.

Bishop Temple's advent was hailed as that of an emphatically strong man, whose strength of character might be trusted to endure; for it had not

been forced by any crisis or emergency, but, like the English oak, it had slowly and patiently matured and grown into hard wood. The phases of faith he had gone through had no doubt been marked, as in 'so many of his contemporaries, by very positive colours and distinct variations of light and shade ; but in every period of his life there had been a consistency of Christian piety and prayer which, in all alternations of storm and calm, had made his personal character stand out like the revolving light on a lighthouse rock. It was to the credit of a Prime Minister, clear as Mr. Gladstone was in his own theological convictions, and sensitive, as any Minister must be, of the delicate springs upon which the favour of ecclesiastics and the conscience of the best churchmen move, to run the risk of offending many of his friends by recommending to the Queen, as ruler of the Church in London, a bishop so little likely to be superficially popular, so terribly in earnest, and in some points so angular as was Dr. Temple. It is always easy to get feeble ecclesiastics of pleasant sentiments, and cleverish churchmen clever at hitting off the sense of a public meeting, and moderate men to make things smooth ; but for work of a higher kind the Church wants a man of grit and steel. London was to have the grit and steel in Bishop Temple. That he accepted the call with a full sense of its tremendous responsibilities, is clear from a note to his old friend, the Right Hon. W. E. Forster, in which he writes, "I am conscious that I have a heavy task before me ; but I mean to do my best."

As regards the appointment itself, it is known that the Premier was divided in his mind between Temple and Lightfoot, and Archbishop Benson has left it on record that Mr. Gladstone, in the course of a conversation on the subject, "refused to

appoint the Bishop of London except on my recommendation." The upshot of their talk was that Lightfoot should be kept in reserve for the Archbishopric of York. "No other name was even discussed."¹

Dr. Temple adopted as his official signature the Latin form *F. Londinensis*, abbreviated to *F. Londin.*;² his immediate predecessor having used the English form *J. London*.

To the clergy of the Metropolis the new Bishop came as a complete stranger, but they all expected great things of him; his reputation for scholarship, ability, and strength of character having produced an impression throughout the diocese that was highly favourable for his future work and influence. This impression was increased by his personal appearance; and few will forget their first glimpse of the dignified, swart, powerful figure—generally alone—as it strode along the crowded thoroughfare or the platform of a railway station. It is not altogether difficult to understand the feeling which prompted one writer³ to observe—

In his face I always saw, or fancied, an indescribable loneliness, which suggested the toiling man, the man who in

¹ *Life of Archbishop Benson*, vol. ii. p. 45.

² He desired to emphasise the connexion between the Anglican Church and the old British Church in every possible way, and laid stress upon the fact that Restitutus is described as *Episcopus de civitate Londinensi* in the list of Bishops who attended the Council of Arles in A.D. 314 (cf. M. L'Abbé's *Concilia*, 1759, vol. ii. p. 476). Dr. Creighton, who succeeded him, maintained that the correct form is, or ought to be, *Londoniensis*, and was wont to sign *M. London.*: "Dr. Temple was very decided in favour of Latin titles," writes the Bishop of Bristol, "and when I was made first Bishop of Stepney and he was writing my name in a Bible, he said, 'Of course you are G. F. Stepniensis?' I replied, 'No, G. F. Stepney.' 'Well,' he said, 'I shall make a sort of blot, and it will do for either.'" It was his desire to give visible expression to the continuity between the modern See of London and the London of Restitutus that inspired his declaration, made in mock solemnity, that he could not allow an Archbishop of Canterbury to carry the Primatial Cross in St. Paul's Cathedral unless he carried his Pastoral Staff.

³ "John o' London" in *T.P.'s Weekly*, January 2, 1903.

himself or his ancestors has wrestled with the forces of nature, has absorbed the gloom of rock and moor and cloud. I have encountered such faces in Cornwall, and in the market towns of Cumberland—faces of dalesmen and sheep farmers. Temple had the genius for solitude which is peculiar to such men.

The enthronement at St. Paul's did not take place until April, but he got to work in the diocese at once. His first Confirmation was held at St. Saviour's, Highbury; and among the earliest public functions in which he took part were the funeral of Lord Mayor Nottidge (who died at the Mansion House, and was the first Chief Magistrate of the City buried in the present St. Paul's Cathedral), and the laying of the foundation-stone of the new buildings of Sion College on the Embankment. In his capacity of visitor to the college, Dr. Temple delivered a characteristic address on the latter occasion, speaking of the advantages which such associations of men might confer upon the members if worthily used, and then pointing to some of the dangers incidental to institutions of the kind. 'It was quite possible,' he said, 'that in a society like that of Sion College, men might find a protection for laziness and self-complacency, since it would not be thought good taste to introduce any subject for discussion which might seem like a reproach to some. He felt confident, however, that the City clergy were seeking to make their ministry more effective, to give unity to their aims, to encourage true toleration with each other in troubles and difficulties, and to promote good feeling and helpful co-operation in the service of their Lord and Master.'

Within a few weeks of his enthronement, the Bishop, in pursuance of the practice he had found and adopted at Exeter,¹ addressed the following letter to the Rural Deans of the Diocese:—

¹ "Exeter" Memoir, vol. i. p. 853. Ed.

FULHAM PALACE, S. W.,
June 1, 1885.

REV. AND DEAR SIR—It is my desire to make the office of Rural Dean not only, as hitherto, representative of the Bishop to the Clergy, but also of the Clergy to the Bishop. For this purpose I propose to appoint in each Deanery the beneficed priest who shall be recommended by the Clergy of that Deanery, and to make a fresh appointment every five years.

I think the clerical representatives of the Deanery at the Diocesan Conference the most suitable persons to conduct the necessary election, and I write this letter to you and your colleagues to ask you to be good enough to undertake the duty.

I wish every one to have a vote who, according to the present constitution of the Diocesan Conference, had a vote for the election of clerical representatives at that Conference, and I shall be much obliged if you and your colleagues will call these voters together and proceed to an election at some convenient time and place before Sunday, June the 28th.

I wish the election to be so conducted that the person finally chosen shall have had the votes of a clear majority of all who vote.—I am, Rev. and dear Sir, yours faithfully,
(Sgd.) F. LONDON :

This notice and its abruptness caused considerable dissatisfaction, and a meeting was held at which it was proposed to protest against it. The proposition was negatived, however, and the elections were duly held, all the former Rural Deans being returned with one exception.

But (writes one of them¹) at our first meeting some strong expressions were used on the subject to the Bishop. He listened quietly, and then rose. "I want," he said, "to work hand in hand with my clergy. Unless we so work together I can do nothing; I shall be useless here. In what I have done in this matter I believe I have acted according to the will of Him who sent me here. If I believe anything to be His will I must obey it; no consideration of any kind must come in the way; nothing on earth can prevent me. If I have offended you I am sorry; but Him I dare not offend."

¹ The Rev. F. H. Joyce, formerly Vicar of Harrow.

As he sat down, Canon Capel Cure whispered to me, "We have a man here; we shall get on all right."

The Bishop announced that it would not be possible for him to hold a Diocesan Conference in his first year, because he did not consider it desirable that he should preside over its meeting until he had made himself better acquainted with the diocese, its needs and character. His primary Conference with the London clergy and laity, accordingly, was held in 1886, and was memorable for three important pronouncements—(1) on the position of the Church of England in this country as regards the claim for equality, (2) on the nature of Apostolic Succession, and (3) on Church Patronage. Each subject was treated with a freshness, force, and originality that gave it permanent worth as a contribution to modern Church thought.

RELIGIOUS EQUALITY.—Formerly a great deal used to be said about religious equality, and those who attacked the Church seemed to think it was quite enough to invoke that principle to determine the question off-hand. But in the course of the controversy it has been shown that that notion has had very little hold upon the nation at large. No doubt equality in its proper place is a word of great power, for, if any man enjoys any kind of privilege, it is perfectly fair to ask him why he should continue to enjoy it any longer. There are many examples of privilege in this country—such as the Post Office, the Government dockyards, and other State manufactories. In all these cases the question may arise why private citizens should not be left to compete for public employment on equal terms; and the answers will be determined by the further question, Is it for the interest of the country as a whole that the system shall continue? If it is for the good of the nation at large that these public works should be kept up, they will be maintained; but on no other plea can they be defended. We see privileged institutions maintained, not for their own sake, but for the service they render to the country; and so the claim of the Church of England will be decided by the question whether, after all, she is not the best agency for maintaining, for

fostering and for promoting the religious life of the country. While she is doing that, I do not believe she will be swept away from the place which she holds. We hear these views as to equality propounded in the name of the Liberal party; but the Liberal party has always maintained the principle that sectional interests must be subordinated to the interests of the community, and they will hardly sacrifice the religious welfare of the nation because there are sectional interests that dislike the Church. I claim for her, by the voice of history, by her present organisation, by the devotion of her ministry to their work, by the affection with which she is regarded by most of the people, that she is serving the country as a whole, and that it would be impossible to replace the services she is rendering the nation if her present position were taken away from her.

APOSTOLICAL SUCCESSION.¹—What is it on account of which the Church claims to have a right that specially belongs to her? Is it not the continuous life which exists between the Church that now is and the Church of the Apostles? Is it not because there has come down to her, through a stream of successive generations, those traditions, those feelings, that way of regarding things in relation to spiritual matters, which we look upon as so precious an inheritance? It cannot be said that the Church bears upon her face the impress of any one man; we cannot say that she is the Church even of a St. Paul, or of a St. Peter; we cannot say—what very often might be said of other Christian bodies—that she bears the mark of any one leader. Nor can it be said that she represents some one doctrine which has been pressed upon men's minds till it seems to be out of all proportion to the rest, as it may be said of not a few other Christian bodies around her. The Church of Christ is as wide as humanity; she holds the truth in its infinite variety and complexity, and so represents to us the original Church which the Lord Himself created. She has come down to us quite as much through the laity as through the clergy; all have shared in handing on the torch of truth and the flame of life. The doctrine of the apostolical succession of the ministry, if it is understood to imply this continuity of the spiritual life, is in its right place; but if it be taught as a means of separating the clergy from the laity and giving them a position of their own, it will

¹ "Exeter" Memoir, vol. i. p. 389; Editor's Supplement, *infra*, pp. 521 and 566.—En.

become a hard, unspiritual thing which will repel many noble minds—as it repelled Dr. Arnold's—and make them say, If this doctrine is indeed a revelation made to us, we have a right to ask for the plainest proof from God's Word to sanction it. Those who agree with me will use their utmost endeavours to gather in the laity and induce them to take a real share in all that is going on around them. If that were done, I feel confident that the Church of England would be enabled to perform a work in the future, such as has never been dreamed of in the past.

CHURCH PATRONAGE.¹—For myself, I have not the slightest hesitation in avowing my opinion that the sale of advowsons is wrong and ought to be stopped, whatever means you may take for that purpose. I will ask those who do not think it wrong to sell advowsons, but who talk about the scandal of selling them by public auction, *why* it is a scandal. If it be not wrong to sell, publicity of sale cannot make it so; for there can be no wrong in doing publicly what is in itself right. There is no question that the consequences of selling advowsons are very serious. The system puts the patron altogether in a wrong position. A patron buys an advowson with a view of putting in some friend of his own, and he therefore considers the interest of his friend instead of the interest of the parish, whereas his first thought should be to get the best man he can for the place. Even if you put into the hands of the Bishop power to restrain presentation, you will be putting the power on the wrong side, because you will only be endeavouring to keep out the unfit man, whereas you ought rather to be trying how to bring in the fit one. The principle upon which you act is that all men are equally fit for every parish, if they are fit at all. Nothing can be a greater mistake. A man may be very fit indeed for a town parish, and yet may be put into a country parish for which he was not suited at all. In point of fact, we constantly see the round man put into a square hole. Therefore, I think that the precautions which have been proposed—excellent as they are—will not be sufficient, and that you must get rid of the sale of patronage altogether; because so long as it continues, so long will patrons take a wrong view of what is their business, and so long will it be impossible to prevent them from acting upon that wrong principle.

There is one class of patrons who do look very closely to

¹ "Exeter" Memoir, vol. i. pp. 424-428.—Ed.

the interests of the parish, and that is the class of resident landed proprietors with a large number of tenants in whose welfare they are concerned. I am bound to say that such patrons constantly look to the interests of their tenants; and that is the reason why a distinction has been made in favour of resident landowners in the Archbishop's scheme before us.¹ On the other hand, great merchants and those who buy patronage almost invariably consider, not the people, but the person who is to be presented to the living.

With regard to compensation of the patron, I do not think it will be possible to refuse it. I believe that the sale of patronage is wrong, but the whole Church and country is *particeps criminis*, and cannot shift the whole burden from itself to the patron and say that he ought to have been morally superior to the rest of the community. Compensation might be made in various ways. The simplest plan would be to make it a charge upon the living; it would be possible to levy a small redemption tax upon all livings as they become vacant, just as a similar tax is charged, which is now very unfairly and unequally levied, but which we hope some day to have put on a better footing—that of first-fruits and tenths. This sale of livings troubles men's minds, irrespective of the evils which come from it, simply as being inconsistent with all deep regard for the solemn duties that belong to the Ministry. It lowers the minister in the eyes of his flock if it be known that he holds his place by virtue of money transactions. He claims to stand where he is as a messenger sent by God. If it can be said that he has come because the person appointed by the Church to select him believes him to be the fittest, there is nothing to lower that claim; but if he comes because a friend of his has purchased the advowson, the claim appears on the face of it absurd. The patron himself is an officer of the Church, charged with a very serious duty. How can it be suitable that so solemn an office should be purchased for money, and that without the slightest consideration, either on the part of the seller or any one else, whether he, the purchaser, be fit for that office? In every other department of life we have abolished the custom. Places in the Civil Service of the Crown were once bought and sold. They can be bought and sold no longer. The Courts of Law steadily refuse to allow a trustee

¹ Archbishop Benson's Bill for the Reform of Church Patronage, 1886.

of any other kind of trust to sell his trusteeship. It is in the Church alone that we still tolerate what in these other cases we denounce as evil. Every other trust is held and administered for the benefit of the beneficiaries; in the Church alone it is not the interest of the beneficiaries, that is, the parishioners, that supersedes all other considerations; it is the interest of the friends of the trustee, sometimes the interests of the trustee himself. In the Church itself we are shocked at every transaction of the kind if applied to the higher offices. We should think it monstrous if the patronage of the bishoprics could be bought and sold; and yet in principle what difference can be drawn in this respect between the patronage of a diocese and the patronage of a parish? No argument about the system working well ever touches this grief, which hurts the conscience, not because of the working of the custom, but because of the custom itself; and in many cases religious souls feel it as a wrong and an insult that they and their supremest interests should be bought and sold, even if the result be the appointment of a desirable minister who is faithful to the discharge of his duty. It is quite true that a very large number of patrons fulfil their trust with the utmost care and in the highest spirit; that nothing can be more conscientious, more diligent, more free from all self-seeking, than the trouble which a vast number of private patrons spend in selecting fit incumbents. But, as a rule, these are not patrons who have purchased the livings. The livings that come into the market constitute a distinct class; they are bought for a temporary purpose, and are sold again when that purpose has been fulfilled.

On November 23, 1886, the Bishop was returning home from Putney station by the private garden entrance in Fulham churchyard, and, while proceeding through the palace grounds in a thick fog, stumbled and fell near the greenhouses. He made light of his injuries, but a day or two afterwards, when it was found necessary to call in medical aid, an examination made it clear that two ribs had been broken. Nevertheless he went on with his work, his stoical endurance of physical pain being matched by his impatience of sympathising remarks. "I am glad your Lordship is

better," a friend would say. "I am not better, I am quite well," was the wonted reply. It was the same in regard to his eyesight, when, later on, it began to be seriously affected by the constant strain of London work. "How are your eyes?" asked a distinguished politician, who had recently been troubled in a similar way. "How are yours?" retorted the Bishop. Nevertheless, he would describe with gusto an incident which occurred after a meeting of bishops at Lambeth. He was being assisted down the long flight of steps that leads to the front entrance of the palace by two brother bishops, and was explaining to them that he could see to go upstairs but not to go down. "Ah! worldly ambition!" sighed the one. "No, spiritual aspiration!" rejoined the other.

The Bishop did not keep a diary in any full sense of the term, but merely jotted down his engagements in a small pocket-book. "These books," writes Mrs. Temple, "were made out for six months ahead, as a rule; and I fear that I often used to dread the sight of what was before us." The entries, written in a fine bold handwriting, and often consisting of a single word only, record fixtures to the number of six, seven, and eight a day. When, on first coming to London, he was asked if he would still keep some outside appointment, he replied, "I shall not begin my work by breaking my word." Engagements once made were never set aside, except on the rare occasions of indisposition, or for what he considered paramount calls of duty—at the command of the Queen or Prince of Wales on occasions in which as Bishop he had to take his part, or on important days in Parliament.

His marvellous physical strength enabled him to accomplish tasks before which many younger men would have quailed. Except for his annual

summer holiday he seldom left the diocese; and he was incessant in preaching, confirming, attending meetings and conferences, and performing in an absolutely ungrudging spirit every duty which attached to his office.

Bishop Bardsley used to tell how, when staying at Fulham, his host said to him one morning, "Good-bye, Bishop, till four o'clock to-morrow morning." Dr. Bardsley inquired what he meant, and the reply was—"After my work in London to-day I shall catch a late train to Bristol, where I must speak to 4000 working-men. Then the midnight train to town will bring me back by 4 A.M." At the breakfast table the following morning Dr. Temple took his place as usual, looking fresh and vigorous as ever. It was characteristic of the Bishop that he would rarely admit he was tired. The only sign of weariness vouchsafed was that he became a little more laconic than usual. "I am afraid your Lordship must be very tired?" said a clergyman who met him one Sunday evening at the railway station of an outlying parish where he was to hold a Confirmation. "Not more tired than a man ought to be," was the curt response. On they walked together in silence, the domestic chaplain following close behind with the episcopal robe-case. "With regard to the service," quoth the clergyman, "I should like to know whether your Lordship's wish is——" The question was cut short by the Bishop's jerking his thumb over his shoulder in the direction of the chaplain, thereby intimating that he did not want to be talked to, and that all necessary information would be given behind.

On another occasion he was met at a suburban station by a stoutish vicar who had hurried thither at express speed lest he should be late for the arrival of the train. "How far is it to the

church?" asked the Bishop. "Only seven minutes' walk," replied the unsuspecting priest. "Do you have to puff and blow like that after seven minutes?" was the crushing rejoinder.

Bishops of London have differed, like other public men, in their views of the relative importance and obligation of social duties. Dr. Temple felt that there were more pressing and imperious claims than these upon his time and purse; and though he always enjoyed the society of intimate friends, he found a formal party of acquaintances too fatiguing after a long day's work to be a source of recreation, and preferred—when he could get it—a quiet evening at home.

Similar reasons prompted him to make Fulham Palace his residence and use London House (32 St. James's Square) as an office for business interviews and meetings of all sorts. He found, as have all other Bishops of London, that the income of the see would not permit of luxuries, and that what was spent in one direction must be saved in another. He once replied to a question concerning episcopal incomes, put to him by a layman, that although he saved a little money at Rugby, when he came to London he had to borrow £5000; and that he had been obliged to apply a legacy left to his wife to repay this, being unable to do so from his income as bishop.

The clergy of London were at first inclined to regard their bishop as cold and unsympathetic, not to say brusque and overbearing; but, with personal knowledge of him, the feeling quite wore away and was exchanged, all over the diocese, for a universal conviction that under the masculine exterior there beat a heart of almost womanly tenderness. The clergy of Hackney will not forget how, on one occasion, when speaking of the supreme value of home influence as a prepara-

tion for Confirmation, he completely broke down in relating an early experience of his own about a fault, then corrected by his mother, which had never been repeated. "She said nothing: she only looked at me with a look of pained surprise; and I have never forgotten that look."

A leading clergyman in the diocese was sorely hurt and offended because, when he wrote to the Bishop that his son was about to become a candidate for Holy Orders, the only reply was a packet of the usual preliminary papers forwarded by the resident chaplain. Many weeks afterwards, however, he received the following note—surely the truest, kindest, and gracefulest on record—which more than atoned for all:—

FULHAM PALACE, S.W.

MY DEAR —,—Your son is first in the examination and will read the Gospel. Will you oblige me by preaching the Ordination Sermon at St. Paul's Cathedral?—Yours faithfully,
F. LONDON:

He did not care for praise himself, and considered that it must needs be as distasteful to others. Votes of thanks were obnoxious to him, especially when they seemed to be formal or official, or when they had reference to business that had to be done. In reply to a vote of this kind, proposed in rather fulsome terms at the close of a meeting of the Bishop of London's Fund, he said, in rather tart tones, "I am sure Lord — means all he says very kindly; but I don't want to be thanked for doing my duty." At a subsequent meeting a member of the council who had heard these words, being asked to propose the usual vote of thanks, amused those present, the chairman included, by humbly apologising for having to go through "what was after all only a form."

He was wonderfully gentle and merciful in his

judgments of delinquents and defaulters of all kinds, especially of elderly men who had fallen into trouble through their own sin. He had a natural reverence for old age, and could not bring himself to deal harshly with it. "Such cases," writes his former Suffragan, the Bishop of Marlborough, "grieved him intensely ; and I have heard him exclaim, with eyes full of tears, 'How could the poor man so forget his priesthood?'" He frequently said, "In the long-run the merciful judgment will bear the best fruit." One of his, Rural Deans tells of his unlooked-for lenience towards a young clergyman who had been guilty of serious misconduct. It was a painful case, admitting at first sight of no excuses, but there were circumstances of palliation. These were laid before the Bishop in fear and trembling, as the offence was of a nature which would specially excite his anger, and it seemed likely enough that he would resent any attempt to soften it down. But he replied to the report by return of post, that though it was essential he should administer a severe reprimand, he fully admitted the stress of circumstances, and would take special care that the culprit should not suffer in the end.

Only in cases of rank hypocrisy was he stern and relentless. On one occasion of peculiar difficulty, writes another friend and colleague, he began our interview with the words (even his naturally harsh voice could not hide his emotion), "Here are we, two ministers of God, going to talk about another in trouble ; let us kneel and pray for him and ourselves." But there was no hesitation in his judgment, nor weakness in his action, as the following incident shows.

A clergyman, whose conduct had been most reprehensible, was informed by the then Bishop of Bedford (Dr. Billing) that the resignation of his

benefice was absolutely imperative. The incumbent demurred, on which the Bishop Suffragan informed him that his case would go before the Diocesan. The man appeared in due course before the Bishop and his Suffragan, and, on entering their presence, was addressed by Dr. Temple in the following words: "The Bishop of Bedford has informed you that you must resign your benefice, has he not?" "Yes, my Lord," was the reply. "Then you will resign at once; good morning." The clergyman went away, thinking doubtless that his bishop was a hard, unsympathetic chief pastor. Had he but understood how tremendous was the effort that drew forth those severe words, could he but have witnessed the scene which followed his withdrawal from the room, or have heard the voice of grief in which the Bishop exclaimed, "What can we do for that poor fellow?"—how different would have been his estimate of the character of one who was, whether in censure or approval, a true "Father in God."

As a preacher, Dr. Temple soon made an impression on London—an impression of blended common sense, ethical force, and spiritual insight. His preaching was always vigorous, and was characterised, especially in his later years, by a constant appeal to the Divine Intention. What did the Lord mean? What did the Lord intend that we should do about Missions, about the support of the Clergy, about the care of the poor? What did He intend His Church to be? His first important sermons in London were preached in Westminster Abbey on social questions, and formed part of a series arranged by Archbishop Benson. The Archbishop's deep appreciation of a course of Good Friday addresses, delivered in St. Paul's Cathedral in 1890, is thus recorded in his diary:—¹

¹ *Life of Edward White Benson*, vol. ii. p. 303.

Went with Hugh from Addington to St. Paul's, where, on the first three days of the week, I had heard the Bishop of London preach. To-day he preached the "three hours" to a congregation which entirely filled the space under the dome and much of the transepts. His treatment was nobler than I had ever heard. He touched the physical suffering of the Lord only as a great man could who was himself ready to bear the will of his Father. But the mental suffering and the spiritual power of forgiveness—only first given to those who were nearest in causing the death we all cause—of embracing the soul which turns—the intensity of mother love, the power of loving at least some one, if love to God and man is cold—then the "thirsting" for the cup against which He had prayed in His submission—and much more were handled in a subtle heroic way—and with a breaking out of manly eloquence more than I have heard yet. It was letting people a little see *what* he is, in spite of his perpetual struggle *μὴ δοκεῖν*¹—carried too far sometimes to be good for others. The vast concourse were chiefly men. My Hugh was greatly impressed.

The Archbishop's letter to Mrs. Temple is well worth recording here :—

ADDINGTON PARK, CROYDON,
Good Friday, 1890.

MY DEAR MRS. TEMPLE—Do, please, give him my most loving love, and assure him how the thousands who heard him will never forget the higher levels to which he lifted them, and the deeper depths in which he walked with them. We went through a spiritual Passion—not the common one, wonderful as even that is. And if you can, tell me that he is not the worse. His dear man-voice was stronger and clearer than in the beginning of the week.—Yours affectionately,

EDW. CANTUAR.

In his utterances generally the real impressiveness was in the transparent and glowing sincerity, more than in what is usually called eloquence, and even beyond the rugged intellectual and moral force of his argument or exhortation.

The present Bishop of London tells of the

¹ "Not to seem to be," in contrast with *εἶναι*, "to be."

wonderful impression made upon the clergy¹ of North-East London at a Quiet Day held at St. Mark's, Dalston, in 1889, when Dr. Temple moved many of his hearers to tears by the intense pathos and spirituality of an address he delivered upon "Looking unto Jesus." He often said that no sermon had ever taken him less than four hours to prepare, but not even his chaplains knew how or when the time was found. One of his chief trials, through the pressure of work in London, was the inability to find opportunity for an hour's serious study—a practice he had never foregone until he came to London—and he often mentioned the loss it was to him. As regards light literature, he delighted in children's books and good works of fiction, though it became difficult to suit his taste with the recent style of novel. As his eyesight failed, the game of "Patience" was his common resource for "driving away cobwebs."² He could stand an examination in Miss Yonge's books, and, on one occasion, he was heard keenly discussing with Lord Rosebery the careers of the May family, in the *Daisy Chain*, as though they were living acquaintances.

His practical sympathy with the blind was as natural as it was beautiful.

He was appointed a Commissioner of the Royal Commission on the Blind, the Deaf and Dumb, etc., of the United Kingdom on July 28, 1885, and reappointed on the formation of the new Commission on January 20, 1886, serving on it until the Report was published in 1889. He was called as a witness and gave evidence on May 19, 1887.

On March 31, 1885, he was elected a member of the Committee of Gardner's Trust for the Blind, but resigned his position on July 4, 1893.

¹ "Exeter" Memoir, vol. i. pp. 442-448.—Ed.

² "Rugby" Memoir, vol. i. p. 232.—Ed.

He was a regular attendant at the meetings until his diocesan duties pressed too severely on him, when he felt compelled to resign.

He took (writes Mr. H. G. Wilson) great interest in the work of the Royal Commission, and on one occasion when I was speaking to him about some evidence previously given he said, "I remember it, but I was not present at the meeting. I have read *all* the evidence as it came to me." I always think this is a splendid example of how nothing would stop him from doing what he considered his duty, when one realises what a difficult task it must have been for a Bishop of London to find time to read evidence which fills a huge blue-book of 876 pages printed in rather small type.

Dr. Temple was president of several institutions for the blind, and took the chair at one of the meetings of a Conference held at Norwood in 1890 on questions relating to them.

CHAPTER II

DIOCESAN ORGANISATION

Suffragan Bishops—East London and Bishop Walsham How—
Parochial organisation—Relations of Suffragans and Arch-
deacons with the Bishop—Patronage—Lay work—Deacon-
esses—Diocesan Church Reading Union.

WHEN Dr. Temple came to London he found but one Suffragan Bishop at work in the diocese, Dr. Walsham How. He soon realised that more episcopal help was needed, and it was partly this fact that gave rise to the temporary feeling of friction between two good men which has been described in the *Life of Bishop How* by his son. Bishop Jackson had entrusted the care of East London to Dr. How, who had limited his work to that area of the diocese; but Bishop Temple, while willing to assign a special district to Suffragan supervision, was not prepared to give up his own immediate jurisdiction over any part of London, and preferred to regard Dr. How as an episcopal curate under orders of his diocesan. Accordingly he wrote, early in 1886, desiring him to take Confirmations, etc., not only in the East End, but in other parts of the diocese, during the year. By that time, however, Bishop How had made his annual arrangements in accordance with his customary practice under Bishop Jackson, and the letter came upon him as “a blow,” against which he penned the following protest:—

STAINFORTH HOUSE, UPPER CLAPTON, E.,
March 1, 1886.

MY DEAR BISHOP OF LONDON—I have done my best as to the Confirmations for this season, but I cannot quite manage all. I enclose a list of those I cannot take.

I am very glad to do all I can to help this year, as you have not yet made any arrangements for further Episcopal help, but it is best to say plainly that I cannot do so again. The strength and happiness of my position has been its concentration upon a manageable area, in which I could know thoroughly all the parishes and all the men. To do what I am doing this time involves giving up a great many things, and some of the weeks are so full of engagements that my heart sinks at the thought of the impossibility at such times of keeping on a level with my correspondence. This is always difficult. Moreover, I have a parish, and I cannot neglect the poor souls in it, especially when my good fellow-workman (Rev. W. Frazer Nash, curate of St. Andrew's, Undershaft) is away for his holiday.

The late Bishop never asked me to take a Confirmation out of my own district, and indeed did not allow any of the clergy in other parts of the diocese to ask me, which I thought unnecessarily considerate. He always had the help of a third Bishop, generally Bishop Tozer, after Bishop Piers Claughton's illness and death. Bishop Bromby is now available, and is generally to be found at his son's, St. John's Vicarage, Bethnal Green. I do not know what pecuniary arrangements were made, but such an arrangement was being made with Bishop Bromby at the time of the late Bishop's death. You are able to do far more than he could, and all the clergy welcome you most heartily, and there is no idea of any separation of East London, nor would we ignore the unity of the diocese. And more than thankfully will I take as many Confirmations in other parts as you are kindly willing to take in East London. But beyond this I really cannot go. Do forgive me for saying this. You see I am inclined to be a little rebellious.

And now I have said what I wanted to say, and can only throw myself on your forgiveness and generosity.—Yours sincerely,

WM. WALSHAM BEDFORD.

Bishop Temple's reply was prompt and emphatic:—

FULHAM PALACE, S. W.,
March 2, 1886.

MY DEAR BISHOP OF BEDFORD—I am exceedingly sorry; but I cannot work on the lines that you lay down. Nor, if you had told me that these were the conditions on which you proposed to hold the office of Suffragan Bishop, would I have consented last year to continue relations with you on that footing.

I do not think it right that I should hand over any part of the diocese absolutely to another. I may delegate work, but responsibility I cannot delegate. Nor, again, is it right that one part of the diocese, very much less than half, should have the whole of one Bishop and part of another, and all the rest (three times if not four times as much) should be left entirely to the latter.

The main business of a Suffragan is, and must be, to aid the principal Bishop. It is no doubt far pleasanter to have a work all to oneself; but it is not consistent with the due working of the whole.

The position you wish to assume is not tenable. A man must either be responsible and rule, or be irresponsible and obey. He must either take the lead or follow. You wish to be free from the responsibility of being chief, and yet to be as independent as if you were chief. That cannot be. I am of course meeting plainness with plainness: this I am sure you will not resent, for indeed you have left me no choice.

God knows I value your work, and I reverence your character. But I am Bishop of the diocese, and cannot divest myself of what belongs to my office.—Yours very truly,

F. LONDON:

An interview followed, at which, after explanations had been made on both sides,¹ a satisfactory compromise was arranged. One characteristic passage from Bishop How's own account of this discussion is well worth quoting here. "I said, 'Supposing you send me a list of what you want, and I find, as I have found in some cases this time, that I cannot manage all, what must be done then?' He said, 'When the Queen commands

¹ *Life of Bishop Walsham How*, pp. 212-214.

me to preach at Windsor, I am obliged to say to any one to whom I may be engaged that I have the Queen's commands to go to Windsor, and so cannot fulfil my engagements.' He wished me not to multiply Confirmations in East London, thinking the clergy inconsiderate in wanting so many. I told him one thing in his letter had hit me hardest, and that was his speaking of the position I 'wished to assume,' as though I had not held it all along. This he explained away, saying he only meant the position I wished theoretically to assume as the one to be maintained, not at all as denying that I had practically held it.

"As I left he said, 'Well, are you happier?' and I said, 'Yes.'"

Bishop Temple's personal affection for Dr. Walsham How was as real as were his admiration for his character and appreciation of his work, and the relations between them were ever afterwards of the most brotherly kind.

But it was not the question of government alone that determined the Bishop's action in this matter. He felt strongly that the position into which East London was drifting was scarcely fair or beneficial to the rest of the diocese. The sentimental glamour attaching to it, largely in consequence of Bishop How's splendid work there, was already drawing attention away from the many poor districts of West, West Central, South-West and North-West London, and almost monopolising the interests of Church people throughout the Metropolis. Bishop Temple felt that the needs of London as a whole must not be sacrificed to those of a part, however important: and he was therefore anxious to co-ordinate the various portions of the diocese under a system which should place manageable areas under the supervision of suffragans who should in all respects be subordinate and responsible

to the Bishop of the diocese. This aspiration found expression at the London Diocesan Conference of 1888, when he said :—

A diocese like ours is peculiarly fitted for the work of Suffragan Bishops; I do not think it is one in which subdivision would be wise, but it is one that requires the labours of more than one bishop; I am disposed to think that it requires the labours of more than two, or even three bishops; and I hope that, as time goes on, we shall be able, with the permission of the Crown, to obtain such assistance as may be absolutely necessary for the work that has to be done.

Already, indeed, he had taken the first step towards carrying this scheme into effect by nominating his old Devonshire friend and colleague, Archdeacon Earle, to be suffragan for West London under the title (allowed under the then unexhausted Act of Henry VIII.¹) of Bishop of Marlborough. It may be mentioned, as a proof of Bishop Temple's large-heartedness, that Dr. Earle had formerly taken an active part in opposing his appointment as Bishop of Exeter; and that when, on one occasion, the circumstance was referred to in his presence, Dr. Temple simply remarked, with one of his broad smiles, "Oh, yes! I remember. You lost your temper that day."

Immediately after Dr. Earle's arrival in London, Bishop Walsham How was transferred to a diocese of his own as first Bishop of Wakefield, and it is an open secret that Bishop Temple was anxious to associate with himself, as his other suffragan, his former pupil and colleague, Prebendary E. G. Sandford, now Archdeacon of Exeter. The Crown,

¹ This Act mentioned eighteen towns which might give titles to suffragan bishops. "Bedford" was selected by Dr. Jackson for East London as nearest at hand: "Marlborough" by Dr. Temple as not then likely to be wanted by the Bishop of Salisbury. Then Dr. Temple got the old Act amended, so that now any town in any diocese may give its name to a titular bishop.

however, did not approve of three West-country bishops for London, and selected the alternative name submitted by Dr. Temple—that of Dr. R. Cladius Billing, Rector of Spitalfields. It is said that Dr. Billing was unaware of the honour proposed for him until he read the announcement of his appointment in *The Times*. On his resignation through ill-health in 1895, the inappropriate title of “Bishop of Bedford” was allowed to lapse, and Dr. G. Forrest Browne, Canon of St. Paul’s,¹ was consecrated under the far more suitable designation of “Bishop of Stepney,” after the most ancient and historic parish of East London. Subsequently Dr. Temple obtained help from a third bishop—Dr. Barry, late Primate of Australia—whom he appointed Rector of St. James’s, Piccadilly, with episcopal duties for Central London.

Jealous though he had thus shown himself for the welfare of every part of the diocese, he always felt a special appreciation for and interest in the East End, as is clear from the following words spoken in St. Paul’s Cathedral at the annual East London Church Fund Festival on St. Barnabas Day, 1888, shortly after the resignation of Bishop Walsham How.

It is very fitting that the Festival of the East London Church Fund should be held on this day—the day on which we call to mind him whom the apostles name the “Son of Consolation”; for it is of the consolations of the Gospel that we naturally think now when we contemplate the work to which this fund is devoted—the preaching of the Gospel in the East of London. It is, above all, the special title of the Gospel that it is the Gospel to the poor: It is the Gospel to those who cannot find any Gospel in this present life. It is the Gospel to those to whom it is indeed glad tidings to hear that this life is not all. It is the Gospel to those who are upheld by the thought that their sufferings shall be short, but the joy that is to follow upon those

¹ Bishop of Bristol, 1897.

sufferings shall be eternal . . . the Gospel that is preached to those who may be sunk in degradation, in misery, in squalor, in ignorance, perhaps even in brutality, and who yet have to learn that, in the midst of all these, it is possible for them to find their Heavenly Father and the Saviour who loved them so that He died for their sakes. . . . What awful problems are presented by a great city like ours, where there is such enormous wealth side by side with such terrible privation! When you think of the vast numbers who day by day know not where they shall find the labour by which they are to live; when you think of the numbers that have been ground down by the competition constantly pressing on them, until what they receive for their labour is barely enough, and sometimes not enough to keep body and soul together; when you think of these men in such masses that it is almost impossible to reach them with the news of something better than this present life; when you think of how day after day this dreadful trouble is increasing with the perpetual increase of the population; when you think of the growing numbers born within this city, of the thousands upon thousands that gather here for one reason and another from all parts of England, and the thousands upon thousands that are pouring in from foreign countries, themselves wretchedly poor to begin with, and helping to make the English poor still poorer by offering to work for still lower wages; when you think of all these terrible puzzles to be solved by this present generation, then indeed you will feel that the call is one that cannot be refused; you must study this question for yourselves, you must do your utmost to find a solution, and you must do your part in bearing the burden. He who refuses, when he has this at his very door, cannot escape the condemnation that was pronounced upon him at whose door Lazarus was laid "desiring to be fed with the crumbs which fell from the rich man's table." That rich man is charged with no sin, he is charged with no crime; his one sin is that Lazarus was there, and he cared not for it. . . . What chance is there of teaching them thrift, of teaching them steady industry, of teaching them such abstinence as is necessary for their own material improvement—what chance is there of teaching such lessons as these unless you will first win their hearts and open their souls to your approach, and unless you first go to them with the message of salvation and tell them that you are speaking a message of love on behalf of Him who loved them? To preach the

gospel of consolation is the very foundation of all that we do. It is hopeless to effect this matter except by making this beginning. . . . The only way to reach the poor is to bid them believe that the Lord Jesus took poverty on Himself for their sakes, that He is able to feel for them, that He lived a life like theirs—to go among them and to speak to them of a love which shall follow them beyond the grave, and make them understand that what is to be borne in this present life is the discipline which shall fit us for the next.

Speaking of Bishop Walsham How, the Bishop said :—

That saintly man who has now gone to work elsewhere in the Lord's vineyard—did not his character penetrate through all the work which this Fund has been used to carry on? Was it not the gospel of consolation that every word of his and every act of his life was constantly preaching? If we would preach the gospel of consolation, is it not his example that we must look to, is it not in his spirit that we must work? If we have learnt anything at all from the lesson of his labours amongst us, ought this work now to be allowed to languish because he has gone to work of another kind? Ought we so to forget him as to permit that to which he gave his very life to pass away because he is here no longer to maintain it?

Bishop Temple's views on the subject of parochial organisation corresponded with his ideas as to the organisation of the diocese. He deprecated the creation of new and poorly endowed parishes, and 'thought the work of a large parish would be better done by additional curates, provided they had the right man at the top. It seemed to him that rectors and vicars did not always take the wisest course. If they wished to retain their parishes undivided, their line should not be to assign mission districts to particular curates, but the rector or vicar should remain still the incumbent of the whole parish, and should be seen all over it. It was often the congregation of the mission chapel that desired independence and wished to

take their own line, and found it a great deal more easy to persuade their own clergymen to do what they wished than to persuade the rector or vicar to allow it to be done.¹

Two other diocesan appointments should be mentioned here. On the resignation of Dr. Gifford in 1889, the Rev. William Macdonald Sinclair, who had been for ten years vicar of St. Stephen's, Westminster, was made Archdeacon of London. Mr. Sinclair was only thirty-nine at the time, and the appointment was criticised on that ground; but he had for some years been an examining chaplain, and had acquired considerable knowledge of the diocese as resident chaplain to Bishop Jackson.

The other archdeaconry—that of Middlesex—was also vacated by the death of Dr. Hessey (who had held it for seventeen years) in December 1892, when Dr. Robinson Thornton, the scholarly incumbent of St. John's, Notting Hill, was selected to fill the post.

Bishop Temple always reposed the utmost confidence in his suffragans and archdeacons, carefully assigning to each his constitutional sphere of work, and meeting them every month for the consideration and arrangement of diocesan business. At these "Privy Council" meetings, which were usually held at St. Paul's Chapter-house after the monthly Confirmation in the Cathedral, he was seen at his brightest, and often said that he enjoyed them more than anything else in his work. All questions of difficulty, including appointments to vacant benefices, were frankly discussed; and though somewhat slow in coming to a decision under circumstances of doubt, he acted promptly and fearlessly when his mind was made up.

His exercise of patronage has been sometimes unfavourably criticised. It has been pointed out

¹ London Diocesan Conference, 1888.

that he would often leave benefices unfilled for many months, apparently with the idea that the congregation after a period of suspense would give their new pastor a better welcome; whereas in the case of churches dependent upon voluntary support the long vacancy was often the source of serious difficulty. No doubt this was true, as also that his patronage was characterised by occasional surprises which did not always appear to be justified by subsequent events. But there can be no question that he regarded his patronage as a sacred trust; and inasmuch as he was himself the sole trustee, he was not very ready to receive suggestions, even from those who might have seemed best qualified to give advice. It was characteristic of the independent spirit of the man—a weakness, perhaps, of his very strength—that he feared to transfer to other shoulders the responsibilities which devolved upon his own.

The appointment of Dr. Earle to the Rectory of Bishopsgate in 1896 was perhaps the most severely criticised of all his appointments; but, though the step was a bold one and naturally unpopular in the City, the Bishop felt that the large endowments of a parish which could only claim five hundred residents ought not to be confined to them, but be used to meet the growing needs of the Church.

Again, it has been said that he was not a good judge of men. "If," writes Bishop Earle, "he had a fault, it was that he thought too well of others,¹ and could not be brought to suspect evil when, alas! not unfrequently evil was present." No doubt a great and generous nature is prone to credit inferior natures with its own virtues of strength, large-heartedness, and singleness of aim, and so the Bishop's confidence was sometimes misplaced. But he was wont to say that he knew the kind of man he

¹ "Exeter" Memoir, vol. i. p. 464.—Ed.

wanted, and selected him, not necessarily for his all-round attainments, but because he was qualified for a certain class of work. The object he had in view was not always that of his critics. To a City living, for example, in which a financial task of considerable magnitude (as he knew) would have shortly to be faced, he sent an energetic vicar of business capacity and experience; while to a church in which a large congregation drawn from all quarters had been kept together mainly by the sermons of a distinguished preacher, he sent a different sort of man with a view to the creation of a stronger parochial feeling. It was his belief that if a man had the requisite zeal, character, and ability, he would *grow* into fitness for a post for which at first he might not seem to be particularly well qualified. He took time—sometimes a long time—in deciding on an appointment, and to a newly nominated examining chaplain, who came to thank him for the honour just conferred, he replied, with a frankness that left nothing to be desired, “I thought over the matter for at least twelve months before I settled in my mind that you were the right man.” His letters offering preferment were usually models of brevity :—

DEAR MR. —,—Are you disposed to accept the charge of . . . ?—Yours faithfully, F. LONDON:

But when occasion demanded he could write in quite another strain, as the following friendly letter to one of his clergy may serve to show :—

FULHAM PALACE, S.W.

MY DEAR —,—I want to ask you some questions which I have no right to ask and which you can of course altogether decline to answer, and if you do I shall not look on your refusal as uncourteous or unreasonable. A patron of an important benefice has been consulting me about filling it up. The man who has left has always been on the High Church side, teaches what are considered High Church views on the

Sacraments, uses the Eastward Position, etc., but is not by any means an advanced ritualist. The patron has put it to me whether you might be asked to succeed him, saying that he was anxious that there should be no sudden or violent break in the character of the ministrations, but that otherwise he liked your ways. He shrinks, however, from putting in a Low Churchman who might change the ritual, teach that no grace attached to the Sacraments, that the Eucharist was in no sense whatever an offering, celebrate Communion in evenings, etc.

I said that you were, as far as I knew, like myself, not a party man at all. But more I could not say. Are you willing to tell me your views on these points, so that I may tell the patron what I think of the matter? I repeat that I shall not be at all disturbed if you decline to answer. You may fairly say, "Let my words and actions speak for me concerning all such matters." But, on the other hand, you may be willing to tell me in confidence enough to guide me in giving advice, and may be ready to state your views frankly to any one who asks you and is not impertinent in asking.—
Yours ever,

F. LONDON :

The advice he gave was always singularly forcible and to the point, nor ever given without careful consideration of the problem submitted for his judgment. He would ask an inquirer to state his case as concisely as possible; then he would put such questions as seemed necessary, and lapse into a silence which any one who knew him never ventured to interrupt. The verdict would come "straight from the shoulder," unmistakably clear and direct. "You ask me whether you ought to accept this appointment and leave your present post, or not. No one can tell you what you *ought* to do. Your own conscience should be the best judge of that. I can only say that were *I* in your place I should go." Or again, as he said to Bishop Walsham How, when the latter was offered the important bishopric of Durham in exchange for the poorer and more arduous see of Wakefield: "The work in Durham is no better worth doing,

possibly even less so, than that of Wakefield; you had better stay where you are."

I am indebted to one of his former clergy, the Rev. F. Hayward Joyce, for a personal anecdote which illustrates the reluctance he always felt in having to acquiesce in the resignation of one whose work and worth he valued:—

I wrote asking for an appointment. He gave me one at the Ecclesiastical Commission, and when I found him there he said that he could only spare me a few minutes, and bade me get to business at once. I. "I want to resign the Rural Deanery of Harrow." B. "Why didn't you write?" I. "Because I felt sure you would refuse my request." B. "Why?" I. "Because when I wrote two years ago you simply replied 'No!' without referring to any of my reasons, and without giving any reasons of your own." B. (smiling grimly) "Well, what are your reasons?" I. "Increase of Rural Deanery, age, general inefficiency, etc." B. "Well, there is something in what you say. You have carefully considered the matter?" I. "Yes; very carefully." B. "How long have you been considering it?" I. "Ever since I wrote to you—that is, two years ago." B. (jumping up) "Oh, I dare say; and you want me to settle in two minutes what you have taken two years to consider? No! Good-bye!" and off he went, chuckling aloud at the way he had tricked me; and vexed as I was, I could not help laughing at being so neatly caught out.

The Bishop was tolerant of one species of self-assertiveness, but merciless towards another. He never objected to a man's applying for preferment for himself and giving a list of his own qualifications for the post, so long as the candidate could substantiate his claims, though he had never (needless to say) acted on such a principle in his own career; but woe betide the man who was pretentious! During an Ordination week at Fulham, a rather self-assertive and talkative candidate ventured to quote some words of Horace at the breakfast-table. "Where does the line come from

and how does the stanza end?" asked the Bishop. The young man was obliged to confess that he had forgotten. "Then you have no business to quote at all," replied the Bishop, "for the words that follow give the passage quite a different sense from what you intend." A similar incident occurred at Fulham Parish Church, where the Bishop was wont occasionally to take part in the services when not engaged elsewhere. A rather juvenile divine preached a sermon of a decidedly ambitious type, and was evidently not a little elated that he had been able to deliver it for the edification of his diocesan. But on the return to the vestry there was no appreciative utterance, and the unrobing went on in silence. Then the Bishop, having donned scarf and overcoat, shook hands with the vicar, and, turning to the preacher, said blandly, "Your text doesn't mean what you said it meant, and if it did, it would not have borne the application you put upon it." Similar snubbings were sometimes meted out, with excellent effect, to the "unco guid," of whom a man like Temple was naturally suspicious, especially if he thought there was any attempt to curry favour with himself. Two ordination candidates, on one occasion at the Fulham dinner-table, were evidently anxious to impress him with the fact that they were total abstainers, and took occasion to boast of their profound ignorance of wines and spirituous liquors of every kind; whereupon, to their astonishment, the Bishop entered upon an exhaustive disquisition on *Vintages of Port*, mentioning the various years in which the grape harvest had failed or succeeded and other factors that determined the quality and quantity of the yield of wine. The youths were overheard exclaiming to each other in pious horror, as they left the hall, "Who'd have thought it *from him!* He talked like a wine merchant."

"There can be no doubt," writes Dr. Welldon, "that he did not 'suffer fools' or bores 'gladly,' and it was characteristic of him that the young clergyman who plagued him with conversation in the Underground Railway should have got little or nothing out of him but the abrupt inquiry, 'What station do you get out at?' To boys and young men he was kindness itself, and," adds Dr. Welldon, "he liked coming among my boys from time to time—not indeed that Harrow boys in his eyes were quite equal to Rugby boys; and I remember how he told them once in Speechroom that he never felt so much at home as in the presence of a great Public School." By his own pupils this affectionate feeling was reciprocated through life, as a London incumbent can testify who saw two of them, soldiers, moved to tears in church on seeing him again after the lapse of many years.

The happiness of the Embertide visits to Fulham will not be forgotten by the suffragans, archdeacons, and examining chaplains, who were all expected to be there if possible. Mrs. Temple was ever the ideal hostess, and the atmosphere of the Palace was sweet and homelike. In addition to the two Archdeacons, there were four other examining chaplains; Prebendary Turner,¹ Canon Browne,² Professor Bevan,³ and the late Prebendary Murdoch Johnstone.

The standard of examination for Holy Orders was raised by Dr. Temple; but he treated exceptional cases exceptionally. He explained that a man might be accepted on the results of the examination or he might be accepted on work done. Thus he gave priest's orders without examination to a deacon of five years' standing

¹ Bishop of Islington, 1898. .

² Bishop of Bristol, 1897.

³ Archdeacon of Middlesex, 1903.

who always broke down nervously if he tried to sit for an examination, and he accepted good work done by lay readers as a qualification compensating for some lack of scholarship.

Though he was sixty-four years of age when appointed to the See of London, he dealt, while at Fulham, with about ten thousand letters a year, and wrote some three or four thousand with his own hand, notwithstanding his defective eyesight. He presided over or was present at about five hundred public meetings and committee meetings each year during his London episcopate. He took some seventy Confirmations annually, and held annual conferences in every Rural Deanery of the diocese. He ordained at least one hundred and fifty priests and deacons each year, giving, of course, private interviews to each, and transacted an abundance of miscellaneous business, besides preaching sermons and giving addresses in all parts of the diocese. For three years his sole coadjutor was Bishop Walsham How, and during Bishop Billing's long illness his only effective episcopal helper was the Bishop of Marlborough.

Dr. Temple's London episcopate was remarkable for its organisation of lay work. In 1885, shortly after his translation to the diocese, he brought before the attention of the Upper House of Convocation a letter which he had received from the Committee for the Training of Readers.

This was a Committee of the London Diocesan Association of Lay Helpers, and they applied to him because they thought that what they were doing might be considered of some value to the whole Province. The movement arose in 1881, in consequence of a letter in the *Guardian* calling attention to the importance of training lay helpers, lay assistants, or lay readers, as they were then called, though, by the latest resolution of the

House they bore the name of Readers. A special feature of the scheme was to take one of the colleges during the vacation for a month's course of training for all readers who were willing to avail themselves of the opportunity, at a charge of 25s. a week. This was done in 1881 and 1882 at Oxford, where the Authorities of Keble College were good enough to admit the readers into the college. In 1883 the course was held at Selwyn College, Cambridge, and in 1884 again at Keble College, Oxford, with the Provost of Worcester College again as Principal. The course included lectures on the Holy Scriptures and the Prayer Book, and instruction in elocution and kindred subjects. At intervals there were Quiet Days, one of which was conducted by the Bishop of Rochester. There were daily services and addresses in the chapel, and conferences held among the readers on subjects connected with their work; and all who had attended had expressed themselves warmly appreciative of the help they had received.

In due course, the Bishop resolved to select a body of laymen willing to serve the Church in London as readers.¹ His hope was that in future years a staff would be formed of dedicated laymen, who, still pursuing the ordinary avocations of this present life, would yet give a portion of their time—and, yet more, their interest and their prayers—to the promotion of the kingdom of Christ.

The institution of this new Order of Diocesan Readers for London took place at St. Paul's Cathedral on Saturday, March 21, 1891, after evensong, the Bishop, who was assisted by his suffragan, the Bishop of Marlborough, performing the rite. Among the eighteen laymen admitted were Mr. G. A. Spottiswoode, the Earl of Stamford, Dr. Cust, Mr. E. A. Ford, Mr. Sidney Gedge, M.P.,

¹ "Exeter" Memoir, vol. i. pp. 501-504.—Ed.

Mr. Eugene Stock, and Chancellor P. V. Smith. The Bishop delivered the New Testament into the hands of each one, as they knelt before him, saying,

Take thou authority to read the Word of God, and to minister in thy office as shall be appointed unto thee by the Bishop, in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.

After commissioning each of the readers separately, in the manner directed, the Bishop delivered an earnest and impressive address, warning them earnestly to keep two things constantly before their minds—(1) to watch carefully that their own inner life corresponded with the work they had to do, and (2) that in all their work, whatever it might be, they should be on their guard in no way whatever to forget the general harmony of the Church's work, and should do their utmost to help those who were charged with the government of souls, and who in all their labours must be responsible to our Lord Jesus at the last day. . . . If, perchance, they had hitherto been led to make the mistake of preferring their own opinions and their own way of working to the welfare of the whole Church, and so had hurt the very cause to which they had professed to give a large part of their lives, he appealed to them not to continue or to repeat such a mistake. He put this before them with the greater earnestness, because he knew the dangers which were in front of them—the danger of hurting their own spiritual life by familiarity with holy thoughts and heavenly doctrines, without the corresponding vitality of the spiritual life in their own souls, and the danger of forgetting to subordinate themselves to the welfare of the Church at large.

The Commission given by the Bishop was in the following terms :—

This Commission is to be held permanently, unless revoked by the Bishop, and entitles the holder (1) to conduct in any parish in which he may be licensed services in schools and other rooms and in the open air, and also such extra services in consecrated buildings as the incumbent may wish, and as the Bishop may approve; (2) to perform occasionally similar duties in any parish of the diocese at the request of the incumbent.

At the London Diocesan Conference of 1891, when he announced the creation of this Order of Diocesan Readers, he also gave public sanction to the institution, under proper safeguards, of a lay brotherhood.

There was another experiment (he said) which he had ventured upon, one which might be still more considered an experiment than the other, and he did not deny that he himself regarded it in that light. He had sanctioned the establishment of a brotherhood of men who were to give themselves entirely and absolutely to a religious life—a life of prayer and devotion and worship, and a life especially devoted to the service of their fellows: men who were able to maintain themselves and their brethren in the same community without appealing to the public at large, and without doing anything to earn their own living; men who, while so living on their own means, were willing to give themselves entirely to such work as they might be called upon to do. He had taken care that their work should be under proper control, and that they should not be employed so as in any way to interfere with the parochial work of the clergy, or work in parishes where the clergy would rather not have their services or their presence. He had taken every precaution to see that what they undertook to do they should be well able to perform. He believed the time had come when it was really necessary that the Church should make use of whatever enthusiasm there might be in the Church, such enthusiasm as they knew had sometimes done great service. They could not afford to refuse the enthusiasm of enthusiastic men. . . . Let them not think that he was unaware of the dangers which always would attend the formation of such institutions. There were dangers which perhaps might develop themselves by and by much more clearly than they had shown themselves yet. He did foresee the risks, and the

necessity of perpetual watchfulness against those risks; but he believed it was possible to control everything of this sort, because he saw in the Church at large more and more of willingness amongst all to act under control, and no longer to desire that, because people were empowered to do certain things, therefore they should be altogether set free from the fetters of a superior authority.

It should be noted that the Bishop did not originate this idea or experiment of a lay brotherhood; he only sanctioned and guided its origination. As he himself declared, it was clearly better that the superior authority in the diocese should wait "until there was something stirring in men's minds already," and till the movement "gave good promise of permanent vitality." The mind of a wise and strong ruler was expressed by him in the terse statement he made to the Diocesan Conference that "his rule had been not to lead until there were those who were ready to follow, and not even then until he was satisfied that those who were ready to follow were ready also to obey." Brotherhoods established on such a principle should surely have more chance of lasting usefulness than far more elaborate organisations.

In connexion with the Bishop's earnest appreciation of Christian character and Christian work among laymen, may be mentioned the feeling tribute he paid to the memory of the Right Hon. W. H. Smith, M.P., on the occasion of the unveiling of two memorial windows in the Church of St. Martin-in-the-Fields on October 6, 1892—the anniversary of the statesman's death.

The Bishop was very anxious that the work of Deaconesses should become more of a leavening power in parishes, so that it might in some measure compensate for, and supply the deficiencies of, the often unskilled and desultory labours of amateur district visitors. He disliked the idea of the

Deaconess becoming the Sister. He saw room for both Sisterhoods and Deaconesses, and wanted to keep their lines of life and work distinct.

When the difficulties connected with the Kilburn Sisterhood came to the fore, he asked the Bishop of Marlborough to conduct an inquiry into the questions at issue and to report thereon. The report recommended that all Sisterhoods should be placed under the supervision of a responsible visitor appointed by the Archbishop. Archbishop Benson fully acquiesced in this proposal, and joined Lord Nelson, who was chairman of the Sisterhood, in urging upon the Mother Superior the desirability of having a fixed constitution drawn up with definite rules and regulations approved by the proper authorities of the Church. "I wrote to her," says the Archbishop in his diary, "saying that her method of receiving illegitimate children—sum down, no questions asked, entirely taken charge of for life—was facilitating vice."¹

Among the various societies inaugurated in the diocese under Bishop Temple's auspices may be specially mentioned the Diocesan Church Reading Union, which was formed in 1890, on the model of similar societies already existing in the Exeter and Canterbury dioceses, at a meeting convened by the Archdeacon of London (Dr. Sinclair) at St. Paul's Chapter-house. On January 6, 1891, the Bishop delivered the first of the inaugural lectures of the Union in the Rubens Room at Grosvenor House, which was kindly lent for the occasion by the Duke and Duchess of Westminster, selecting as his theme "The Use of Lectures."

The Bishop first explained the reason of the title given to the Society:—It is a Society to which Church people are invited to belong, because its object is to encourage them

¹ *Life of Archbishop Benson*, vol. ii. p. 640.

to study subjects connected with the Church ; the chief of these are the Bible, Church History, and Christian Evidences.

He then went on to impress the minds of the audience with a sense of the futility, and even danger, of attending a course of lectures without a considerable amount of private reading on the subject embraced by them. This led to an able exposition of the art of teaching ; the way the child is trained in mechanical exercises, such as the multiplication table, and Church Catechism (of which the Bishop expressed himself a warm advocate), which he cannot understand at the age when he learns them, but without which proficiency in the higher branches of study is unattainable. A great deal must be learnt by heart at the time when memory is strongest, and the power of thinking is undeveloped and incapable of sustained effort. Then, when the memory begins to grow less retentive, there comes the time for exercising that other great faculty of the mind—original thought. The Bishop pointed out what an amount of training a man undergoes before he is considered ready to take advantage of the lecture-system at Oxford or Cambridge. All through the first ten or twelve years of his education he is under the ever-watchful eye of teachers, who are occupied in instructing him and correcting his exercises, and it is not till he has been through a severe curriculum that he is allowed to exchange the lesson for the lecture.

Listening to lectures is as pleasant a way of spending time as any, but mere amusement should never be sought therein, and unless the listener reads the books recommended, after a very few weeks, or even perhaps days, he will find he knows no more about the subject than he did before he went to the lecture, and, moreover, he will possibly imagine he knows a great deal about it, and this may get him into difficulties. In fact, the abler the lecturer, the more likely is this to be the case, for a first-rate lecturer will leave nothing unexplained as he goes along, and the hearer will not be aware that there is any part of the subject he has not grasped.

But a lecture carefully prepared for and attentively heard will be an immense help. The lecturer will make many points clear which his pupils had either not noticed or failed to understand. Two illustrations from the New Testament were here given by the Bishop. A lecturer might point out

the changed attitude of the Jewish Priests towards the Gospel to be noticed between the beginning and the sixth chapter of the Acts. This would at once be apparent to one who had read the Acts, when his attention had been directed to it, though, unassisted, he might not have noticed it, but the remark would be entirely lost on a person who had not read them. Again, a change of method must have taken place in the management of the disciples' worldly goods, for at first we are told they had all things in common, but in writing to the Corinthians St. Paul speaks of a collection being made for the needy members of the Christian body. This also serves to show the different impression that would be made on the mind of one who had studied the New Testament for himself before coming to the lecturer, and on that of another who had omitted to do so.

A lecture may be compared to a guide in Alpine climbing. Without a guide we may reach the top of the mountain, but it will not be without expending a great deal more time and labour on the ascent than if we submit to being helped by an experienced climber; and we may if left to ourselves either come to some insurmountable barrier and have to return, or fall into a pitfall we knew nothing of.

In an age when the mind is brought very keenly to bear on every other subject, it is most important that it should be exercised on the study of what we believe. It is not enough to believe with the heart; until the mind as well as the emotions are enlisted, a man's religion, which should be all-embracing, will be but imperfect.

Passing on from lectures to lecturers, the Bishop said:—

You very often have, no doubt, a man of powerful intellect who will gather up enough to make a very good speech out of a very little information, and he may impose upon other people, impose upon students of a particular subject for a time, but he cannot for long. I remember once at Exeter that I was engaged to attend a meeting of students of science where I had to speak on a particular branch which I had studied, and about which I had a good deal to say; but, unluckily for me, that very day I caught so severe a cold in the throat that I was unable even to whisper, and it was impossible to put off the meeting. A friend of mine—a

still living friend and a dignitary of the Church—came quite unexpectedly to stay with me for a few nights that very day, and I communicated to him the difficulty I was in, and I put before him such notes as I thought would help him to understand the whole matter. He knew absolutely nothing at all about it, but nevertheless he went in. I took him with me to the place, and he made a capital speech in which he went over the various points that had been brought before him, and nobody there present had the least idea but that he was a complete master of the matter. But there can be no doubt at all if anybody present among those students—for they were students—had had an opportunity of cross-examining him, he would have been found out to be grossly ignorant in the course of ten minutes. The real student knows perfectly well, and it is the thing of great importance in practical life, that nine-tenths of all good work, whatever it may be, is what we usually call drudgery, has a mechanical character about it, seems to require no exertion of the higher faculties whatever; in fact, requires nothing more than orderliness, and even that orderliness working in a mechanical way. Nine-tenths of all good work is labour in which those who are engaged cannot feel any conceit at all; it is not possible to be conceited over it because of the nature of the labour itself, and the man of genius is distinguished from others mainly by this, that he sees, all through, what this mechanical drudgery is going to lead to, and he knows the value of it from the beginning, and consequently is ready to give the mechanical labour for the purpose of the result which he is sure will follow by and by. The true road to true knowledge is persistent regular study, and you cannot get your true knowledge without it.

CHAPTER III

CONFERENCES, LECTURES, AND ADDRESSES

Baptism—Holy Orders—History and practice of the Church of England—Conduct of Church services—Sermons—Knowledge of the Bible—Relation of the Church to the poor in England—Statistics—The Lincoln judgment—Ritual—Foreign missions—Scepticism and indifference—The observance of Sunday—Evolution (address at the Shrewsbury Church Congress)—The study of Church history—Faith (an address at Sion College).

NOTHING served to bring the Bishop into closer personal relations with his clergy than his custom of annually visiting each Rural Deanery,¹ when he spoke his mind upon some important subject, and gave instruction to both clergy and laity which will never be forgotten by those who heard it. He thus came into touch with the clergy in groups not too large to admit of personal recognition, and under conditions that enabled him to gather something of the diverse views of those who thus met him. What he said was invariably direct and practical, and full of that freshness and originality which always seemed to give even the most familiar and well-worn subjects a new and living interest. On one occasion he spoke of Baptism and Confirmation in words that went to the root of the theological doctrine involved, and showed its connexion with the fundamental principles of human nature and

¹ "Exeter" Memoir, vol. i. pp. 355-357, also pp. 430-442.—ED.

human life. "The grace of God's spirit is given for different purposes at different times of life ; but the gift cannot avail unless it is used by the recipient. If it is not 'stirred up' by the active co-operation of the will and the energies, it will lie dormant and useless in the soul. Hence the number of baptized and confirmed persons who are as though they had never received the gift at all."

He spoke of Baptism as "the bestowal of a germ of spiritual vitality which, if cultivated, will grow with a child's growth like his natural faculties, and enable the higher but feebler impulses of his humanity to triumph over those lower selfish ones, which are unhappily the stronger."

On another occasion, dealing with Holy Orders, he reminded his clergy of the tremendous responsibility laid upon them. "We are called not by man but by God. Our commission is given us, not by a congregation of men who, having given it, can take it away again, but by the Church of Christ, that is, by Christ Himself. To Him we are directly responsible. The burden is upon us for life."

Again, who that heard them will forget his characteristic words to a thorough John Bull layman at a St. Marylebone Ruridecanal Conference. This layman had said :—

I thank you for your defence of the Church as an establishment ; but I do not believe in it, and for this reason—the Establishment is making the Church of England downright Roman Catholic. I will give two instances to prove this. When I was a boy we were very jealous of the use of the surplice—your Lordship will remember the surplice riots at Exeter—but now we have numbers of large choirs of men and bits of boys in cassocks *and* surplices. As a thinking man I ask myself, How is such a thing possible in Protestant England? and I say it is the Establishment. My second instance is this. When I was a boy we would not permit confession to a priest if we knew of it. Your Lordship will remember that we burnt the vicar of Lewes in effigy. But

now we see people going to priests for confession by the hundred in broad daylight and not very far from here, and they don't care the snap of a finger for you! As a thinking man I ask again, How is this possible in Protestant England? and again I have no hesitation in saying that such a state of things could not exist if it were not for the Establishment.

The significant reply was:—

I suppose speaker No. 2 will not think that the entire history of the Church of England is compressed in his own lifetime. I knew Mr. Toplady's parish, the author of "Rock of Ages," and I knew that when he visited his people he visited them in both surplice and cassock. With regard to confession, it is a pity that so zealous a Churchman as speaker No. 2 should not have tempered his zeal with a little more knowledge. Had he consulted that excellent manual, the Book of Common Prayer, he would have seen that what confession was before the Reformation, that it was after; and what it was after, that it was before. The disciplinary use—I admit an important matter—was its only difference. There is one thing, however, that with all my heart I agree with speaker No. 2, and that is, *I do protest against persons coming to confession to confess other person's sins.*

One year he took the opportunity of giving some practical hints about the conduct of Church services, beginning his address with an apology for 'having never been a parish priest himself, but hoping he had made up for all deficiencies by the extensive opportunities he had enjoyed as a Bishop of impartially criticising his brethren.' He urged the importance of good reading,¹ especially of the lessons, which were "often handed over to a junior curate or to a layman as though they were of no importance, whereas their effect on the congregation ought to be one of the chief elevating and instructing influences of the service." He deprecated stagey reading, or reading that was pompous and in the "preaching" style. He had in former

¹ "Exeter" Memoir, vol. i. pp. 437, 438.—Ed.

days "heard Newman read the lessons at St. Mary's Church,¹ Oxford, in his quiet silvery voice, yet in tones so subtly full of pathos and keen intelligence, that sometimes the congregation would remain as if spell-bound at the close."

His advice as to sermons² was excellent :—

Whether you preach written or extempore sermons, always *prepare* very carefully, and take plenty of time. A good sermon must be in one's thoughts all the week, at least, before its delivery. It had been said that the extempore preacher went to bed with his sermon in his head, whereas the preacher from a manuscript had his sermon under his pillow. He had nothing to say as to the superiority of one practice over the other. A man must adopt the plan that suited him best; or, wiser still, try both plans, and be a slave to neither. Each had its drawbacks and each had its merits.³ Better than either, no doubt, was the ability to preach—like Liddon—a written sermon as though it were not written.

Commenting on the prevalent ignorance of the Bible among all classes, he recommended the occasional preaching of sermons of an expository character⁴ which should deal with the history and contents of a whole book or part of a book. In reference to this advice it was that a strong-willed

¹ "Earlier Years" Memoir, vol. i. p. 65.—Ed.

² "Exeter" Memoir, vol. i. pp. 431-437.—Ed.

³ Speaking at Westminster, at the opening of the new headquarters of the C.E.T.S. in November 1892, the Bishop incidentally referred to sermons :—

"It is a very long time since I preached a written sermon in the pulpit, but when I did preach written sermons, which I did for a considerable number of years, I always used to find that, after I had preached the same sermon in different places, say five times, I had had enough of it, whether other people had had enough of it or not. I became thoroughly tired of the whole thing, and was obliged to turn my mind to something altogether different; and I have always advised preachers, after having preached a discourse a certain number of times, without laying down how long they might have been in doing it, to burn such sermons. I am convinced myself that the best way always is to write your sermon three times over, and then to burn it, and preach what you remember of it." (Compare "Exeter" Memoir, vol. i. p. 433.—Ed.)

⁴ "Exeter" Memoir, vol. i. pp. 432 and 434.—Ed.

clergyman of note in the diocese said, in the course of subsequent discussion, "Were I to preach such a sermon as your Lordship recommends, my congregation would be simply exasperated by it." "I have no doubt," retorted the Bishop in his reply, "that any exposition by Mr. — would be highly exasperating." His want of experience as a parish priest was seldom evinced; but now and again the clergy would detect in certain counsels of perfection an inadequate appreciation of their ordinary difficulties. Thus, speaking at Hackney of church choirs, he recommended the utmost care in the selection of voices and the choice of simple congregational music. A dozen incumbents at once rose to point out that there were often no voices to select from, that good singers usually wanted to be paid, and that a well-trained choir could rarely be kept together by "simple congregational music." "I dare say you all know a great deal more about it than I do," was the good-humoured reply; "but still I think that a little *firm and wise tact* might go a long way towards overcoming such obstacles as you have mentioned."

It has been said that on these occasions the Bishop was too much inclined to treat his clergy as schoolboys. In answer to this charge it should suffice to quote the remark of one of them:—"When he did, we richly deserved it, and we were all the better for being back in school again." The strong men were rarely found to complain of the strong hand; and most of them, as Dr. Gore has truly said, gloried in getting a well-merited snub from him. The moral discipline of such snubs must have been wholesome for the souls of the superior clergy. It was well that the dignitary of metropolitan repute should be saluted on rising to his feet by the upturned tortoiseshell eye-glasses and simple demand, "Yer name?" The brethren

assembled would not have had it otherwise. Moreover, there were common errors of grammar and phraseology which were seldom ignored, even on state occasions; as when a pompous Rural Dean opened a meeting unctuously, "I am very pleased, my Lord ——" "No, you are not; you are *much* pleased," interjected the Bishop, with a broad smile that won the heart of every curate present.

It is impossible to give an adequate idea of his Ruridecanal addresses in the limited space of this chapter; but so exhaustive were they in the treatment of the subjects selected that little remained to be said when he had finished speaking. One characteristic of them was the thorough and interesting manner in which the general theme was dealt with before any of its special details or applications were considered. Here, for example, is the gist of what he said by way of preface to an address on the "Relation of the Church to the Poor in London":

England had suffered from changes in circumstances and conditions in the last 500 years, during which the gap between the highest and the lowest classes had increased; the better education of the upper classes being the cause. At the Reformation the upper classes found the value of education, but the lower ones were not thought of; a change might come, but could only come slowly. There was also the changed character of the mode of doing business, as represented, for instance, by companies; directors and shareholders taking the place of firms and individuals who took a *personal* interest in their employees. The charities of old days breathed the spirit of personal sympathy, now so diminished. It was all-important to restore this kindly intercourse. . . . The two main matters could not be parted; spiritual help failed unless allied to material benefit. A man once made a Christian would help himself in a material sense.

Again, in dealing with what is usually made a dull subject—a thing of statistics and bald appeals—the Bishop of London's Fund, the following

interesting facts and principles were placed before the clergy. Speaking of the remarkable growth of the Metropolis, the Bishop stated that there were two causes for it. One was the unaccountable and extraordinary rate of increase of the population of England since 1800, for which no parallel in history could be found. France and Spain were stationary, Italy increased very slowly, and Germany without rapidity; Russian statistics could not be obtained; in the United States the increase was due greatly to the influx of outsiders, apart from which such increase corresponded to that in England in the eighteenth century; in the Roman Empire there had been, from Augustus downwards, a great decrease. A remarkable fact was the gathering of the population into the towns. He (the Bishop) had made special investigations as to certain parishes in Devonshire from 1783 to 1883, with corresponding results; the population increased up to 1830, and then diminished, and in 1883 was the same as in 1873. The towns had grown enormously, and the larger the town the larger the increase. London owed its increase both to births and incomers. In regard to the East End, the artisan population had many more children than gentle people, but a considerable proportion of the increase were weaker than their fathers; strong comers from the country thrust aside the weaker ones. There was no efflux from London. Two classes of society had the benefit of both London and the country, namely, the upper class and the tramps, the latter coming in the winter to London and living on their poor neighbours, and becoming to a great extent the "unemployed"; but the great body of Londoners between these two classes would not give up London. All these reasons resulted in the enormous annual increase of 40,000. The consequence was an inadequate supply of churches and clergymen, the cost of land kept

away the Nonconformists; and hence there were more people in London without places of worship than anywhere else in England. It was the duty of the whole body of Church people to help each other to hold fast the faith; for the masses, public worship being wanted, would drift from religion altogether, and there would be nothing to remind them of spiritual and moral truth. Where religion went, morality followed. A man being a Christian was strengthened in regard to the troubles and temptations of life; but, God's law being faint in his mind, he could not cope with and resist them. What was the remedy? To preach the Gospel, and to supply ministers and churches and all that pertained to them. Who must supply them? Not the ministers, but the body of the Church—the laity—whose duty it was to maintain the ministry.

In the addresses which he gave at Ruridecanal Chapters in 1892, the Bishop dealt at some length with the Archbishop's judgment in the Bishop of Lincoln's case, in which he had been one of the assessors.¹ his addresses on the subject being distinctly *ad clerum*. He laid down no general rule as to what the clergy were bound to do, but simply advised them, before making changes in the ritual which they found in any church to which they were appointed to minister, to consult their diocesan and follow his ruling. 'In thus acting,' he said, 'they were entrenching themselves in a perfectly secure position, seeing that without

¹ The Archbishop (Benson) was assisted by the Bishops of London (Temple), Oxford (Stubbs), Rochester (Thorold), Salisbury (Wordsworth), and Hereford (Atlay), the latter taking the place of the Bishop of Winchester (Browne), owing to the enforced absence of the latter from ill-health. It was an open secret that Dr. Temple was the Archbishop's chief adviser throughout the trial, which commenced on July 23, 1889. Judgment was not delivered until November 21, 1890; and the Privy Council sustained the judgment by a unanimous decision on August 2, 1892.

the Bishop's sanction no one could prosecute them.' It is well known that the Bishop always adopted what is technically known as the north-end position at the celebration of the Holy Communion, and it was not suprising therefore that he should have laid great stress upon the merely permissive character of the recent judgment, urging that no one was bound to obey it on that head, unless, as priest in charge of the services, he elected to do so in the conscientious belief that the position was required and intended. In other words, the Bishop seemed to take the view that, while the judgment permitted, and virtually recognised, the eastward position, the mixed chalice (when the mixing took place before the service), altar lights (when they were lighted before the service), and the singing of hymns during the time when the people were communicating (provided they were so sung as not to prevent the communicants from hearing the words of administration), he did not for a moment rule that any clergyman was bound to perform, or sanction, these acts. The priest was, in effect, to be the arbiter of his own procedure, subject to a reference to the Bishop, as Ordinary, on all doubtful points.

On one occasion he is said to have expressed his opinion that it was "perfectly lawful" to move the Communion Table into the body of the church, though he did not recommend such a proceeding.

The Bishop further explained to the clergy that the principle adopted by the Archbishop's Court was that nothing was to be *added* to the form prescribed in the Book of Common Prayer. He pointed out that the first point in the indictment—that of the lighting of candles not required for giving light—had given occasion for drawing the Canonists' distinction between a "*ceremonia*" and a "*ritus*," the former being something done, the

latter being the same thing with the addition of words. In dealing with this subject, as well as with the mixing of the chalice, the ablutions, and the singing of the *Agnus Dei*, the Bishop ignored, in the most striking way, any doctrinal significance. The greater part of all wine was water. To add water did not affect its character, because it was only increasing one ingredient. A hymn in the course of Holy Communion being permissible, and this hymn being in itself orthodox, it could not be unlawful to sing one orthodox hymn more than another. In the case of each point, except that of the ablutions, which he treated very lightly, the Bishop gave interesting sketches of the history of the ceremony. The same was the case with regard to the eastward position,¹ where again he minimised the importance of the different views. The north side, he contended, represented a court circle where the sovereign, with his ministers on either hand and his people before him, bestowed gifts upon them. Thus the north side brought the Communion aspect of the Eucharist into prominence. The eastward position made a different impression. It represented, not the sovereign giving, but the subject offering—the sacrificial aspect. In the New Testament the former was the prominent idea, and the latter, though present, was subordinate: in early Christian times the latter rapidly grew into prominence until it became almost the exclusive view. There could be no doubt that the eastward position and the sacrificial aspect went together. With the great body of the laity the Communion aspect was the one most commonly taken, and therefore they did not like the eastward position.

Having reviewed the whole judgment, the Bishop went on to make some remarks upon ritual

¹ See Editor's Supplement, p. 663.—Ed.

changes in general. They were the natural outcome of the doctrinal changes introduced by Hugh James Rose, Hurrell Froude, Newman, Pusey, and others, but they were not the work of the original Tractarians. Pusey, he believed, never varied in his ritual till the day of his death. Those who now desired to make changes of ritual seemed to him to form four schools of thought. First there were those who wished to get back to the primitive Church. But which primitive Church? That of the first, second, third, or fourth century? and were they prepared to go back to primitive usage in the things they did not like as well as in those they did? The second class wished to vindicate the unity of the English Church through all her history, and argued that what was allowed in mediæval times ought to be allowed now. But they could not strike out of that history all that happened between Henry VII. and Victoria, and especially what happened in 1661. The third class considered all these things as means to an end—the spiritual life of their people. If they found the form used was not suitable they would use others. This was a position open to a Nonconformist, but not to a Churchman. The fourth class consisted of those who deliberately imitated the Church of Rome. While objecting to her supremacy and her errors, they held that her ritual was perfect. The Bishop reminded all alike that they were bound to the prescribed form in honour as well as in law. If any one were really in doubt as to the legality of any practice he should ask the Bishop, and, if he desired to make a change, should get the permission of the Bishop.

This address provoked, naturally enough, no little controversy in the various deaneries of the diocese, and amusing incidents were not wanting at the Chapter meetings. One incumbent, who

had spoken at great length and had severely criticised the judgment in reference to the mixed chalice, argued that at his church they had no flagon for the wine, but two cruets, one for wine and one for water; and that the mixing—though it took place in the course of the service, before the Church Militant Prayer—was not conducted as a “ceremony.” The Bishop explained that it was a ceremony because it took place during the service, even though it was done quite unostentatiously. “But with respect to the little cruets, my Lord,” said the irrepressible one, “may I hope——?” “I have no respect for the little cruets,” interrupted the Bishop blandly, “and there is no hope for them. Why cannot you have a flagon like everybody else?” Another clergyman overstepped the bounds of episcopal toleration by violently attacking the judgment at every point, in spite of the Bishop’s expressed wish to the contrary. The Bishop let him have his say, but in his reply at the close of the discussion dealt with points raised by other speakers without noticing the offending utterance, until, as the hands of the clock reached the hour for prayers, he quietly added, “Mr. — also made some remarks. Let us pray.”

The Bishop’s practice of taking the north-end position at the celebration of the Holy Communion was the cause of heart-burnings in certain churches. One vicar ventured to expostulate mildly in the vestry before service. “My Lord,” he began, “it is the custom in this church for the celebrant to take the eastward position.” “It will not be the custom this morning,” was the reply.

The following extract from the *Church Missionary Intelligencer* deals with another subject brought before the London clergy at their Chapter meetings.

We had the privilege of hearing one of the Bishop's addresses to the Ruridecanal meetings of the clergy on Foreign Missions, on January 21, 1895, and a more masterly presentment of the subject we have never listened to. The Bishop told the clergy with perfect plainness (1) that they were bound to instruct their people about Missions, not as an outside matter, but as an integral element in religious life; and (2) that they first needed to instruct themselves. Then he dwelt on four subjects of study—two more, and two less, essential—viz. (1) the New Testament, definitely and deliberately as a missionary handbook; (2) early post-Apostolic Missions; (3) the Missions of the Dark Ages, which brought Northern Europe to a profession of Christianity; and (4) modern Missions—1 and 4 being the essential subjects. Then he dealt with objections, and urged the lifting up of the Missionary cause above the idea of money collections, saying that he wished his clergy would preach twenty missionary sermons every year, not in the way of appeals for others, but as an indispensable part of Christian instruction profitable for the people themselves. We earnestly hope that this most remarkable address will be published, for we do not remember hearing anything quite like it. If the London clergy are not stirred up to quite a new sense of their obligations in this matter, their Bishop at all events will be free from responsibility—he has delivered his soul.¹

In 1888 the subject for discussion at the afternoon Chapter meetings was “The Growth of Scepticism and Indifference”; “The Observance of Sunday” being selected for the conferences of clergy and laity that followed the Chapter meetings in the evening.

As regards the former subject, the Bishop

¹ “His love of missions was so keen,” writes Bishop Welldon, “that the Evangelisation of India came home to his heart. It struck me sometimes that his speeches on the subject were too general; I wished he could have entered more into the needs, opportunities, and difficulties of particular missions. But as often as I sought his advice regarding the affairs of the Church in India, he gave it readily. He talked to me for some time once at Lambeth about the connexion of the Church with the Government in India; I think he valued it, but he doubted if it would last.”

recommended the following methods of dealing with religious difficulties.

I. In training the young, teach naturally, as you would have taught had there been no difficulties at all, with two provisos :—

(a) Do not lay stress on things which will afterwards have to be unlearnt, so that faith may not be bound up with such things.

(b) It is right to let the young feel that they do not understand the whole, but that they should keep their minds in readiness to accept new modes of handling things not possible to them at present.

II. In dealing with doubters, deal with them individually and in private, because :—

(a) often their doubts rest on mere misconception, and

(b) you can press the argument from conscience and religious teaching in a way you cannot in public.

III. If the case requires public controversy, two cautions should be observed :—

(a) Let no one enter into it unless he is master of his subject ; and

(b) unless he have the faculty and the training needful for ready debate, and for appreciating other men's arguments. It is necessary that the mind should, for this purpose, be one that will work quickly.

The Sunday question is so much with us nowadays that it may be useful to give fully the Bishop's line of argument on the subject. Referring to the then recent action of the Upper House of Convocation in regard to the growing neglect of Sunday observance, he deplored the general tendency to give up the Sunday to amusement or recreation, without regard to the religious uses and duties of the day.

There was a serious danger (he said) of the day being seized by the pleasure-lovers ; and the money-lovers were sure to follow. Competition was tending to grow keener, and was only checked by the feeling that the day belonged to God. If this were removed there would be no check

III CONFERENCES AND ADDRESSES 61

sufficient to keep the Sunday from being used by the employers of labour.

There was no ground for identifying the Sunday and the Jewish Sabbath. It was easy to be over-strict in observing it, but it had been a great blessing to the world for many centuries.

The history of the question was easy to trace. The beginnings of the observance of the Lord's Day were found in the New Testament, and the day was observed by the Christians from the apostolic times onwards side by side with the Jewish Sabbath. The Jewish Christians continued to observe the Jewish Sabbath, and where the Jewish Christians were in the majority the Gentile Christians followed their example. The observance of the Jewish Sabbath disappeared as the Jewish Christians became a smaller and smaller portion of the Church at large, and so the Jewish Sabbath passed out of the Christian Church, but left behind it a certain sense that the Lord's Day represented that institution, the commands relating to it being considered to apply to the Lord's Day. But the two were never identified. There was a parallel observance of the two days, and one which took the same sort of position as the Jewish institutions in general took in the Christian Church. Christian writers often drew parallels between Jewish and Christian ordinances, as between Baptism and Circumcision, the Holy Communion and the Passover.

But there was a marked difference between the two. In the Jewish Sabbath the leading idea was that the day was a day of rest from labour. The day was consecrated to God, but the way in which it was to be kept was by abstaining from all labour. The Jews had a controversy with Our Lord on many points in connexion with this, as the case of healing the sick on the Sabbath. Our Lord would not lay down small frivolous details, as that it was work to rub out the ears of corn. There was one kind of work that must be done—that connected with Divine worship; and the Temple work was physically very heavy indeed, not only from the ordinary sacrifices, but from the voluntary offerings, and the sin and trespass offerings made by individuals on the Sabbath; and yet the work was held to be lawful. Still, there were some of the Jews, as is seen from the Rabbinical writings, who desired to restrain even this.

In the Lord's Day the leading idea was not on that side. The day was regarded as an appropriate day for all works of

charity, attendance on the sick, and things needful for human comfort. One thing identified it very early with the Jewish Sabbath, and that was that as far as possible Christians were not to work at their ordinary secular occupations on the Lord's Day. They were not to work at that kind of occupation which makes money, which falls in with their avarice and ambition. The idea, then, differed as regards the original conception of the day; that of the Jewish Sabbath being rest, and that of the Christian being the commemoration of the Lord's Resurrection and therefore the new life, and it aimed at spiritual activity, together with the cessation of all secular work.

This was, however, only the idea, because of the enormous proportion of slaves to freemen in the Christian Church, the proportion being in some places, as *c.g.* Attica (Athens), as large as five to one. The slaves had no choice in the matter, because they were ordered to work, and had to do it. Afterwards Constantine made a decree against slaves being enforced to work on the Lord's Day.

The two ideas coincided in regarding the days as Holy by special public worship, religious instruction, and by doing special Christian work, works of mercy and charity.

There was also the mechanical link, because the Lord's Day preserved the division of time into weeks, and kept one day in seven.

The Lord's Day has been kept ever since, and because the Jewish Sabbath was kept by God's command, it has become *mutatis mutandis* the Christian representative of what the Fourth Commandment inculcated.

Its loss would be terrible:—

(1) Because it is the one institution which holds all Christians together; because it is the only institution which is universal, and the one visible witness of Unity. There are two things that hold Christians together, Sunday and the Bible. Christian unity is imperative, and we should not therefore break down any link.

(2) Because it is for a very large proportion of Christians the great support of religious life. Some might still do their best without it, but these would be the last to wish to give it up, and for the great mass it would be the straight road towards surrendering religion altogether. Its regular return independent of our feelings and moods, with its old associations—to give up this would be the direct road to giving up all. We should have to give up the rest from

physical toil and toil of the brain, and this would be a greater loss to us than to any other Christian nation, because our life is so closely bound up with it. At the Reformation we gave up Saints' Days altogether; and Festivals connected with our Lord's life—Christmas Day and Good Friday—were almost gone in the last century but for the exertions of Bishop Porteus. We have given up, practically, the Feast of the Circumcision (known as New Year's Day), the Ascension, and the Epiphany. The religious life has fastened on the observance of Sunday, and it would mean the more to us, therefore, to give it up.

Yet there is reason to fear that we are on the way towards it. It was not wise to make it a Jewish Sabbath. The rule should be to keep the day holy for yourself, and to do what you can to help others to keep it holy, this being the spirit of the Fourth Commandment. We have no power but our influence, but that is great. There is too much mere amusement which involves more labour than there ought to be, and which is not of a kind to turn the thoughts to high and heavenly things. We must not find fault with those who work hard all the week if they get outside into the green fields and fresh air. But they must not turn the day into a picnic. They might remember the Lord's Day even when in the country. The upper classes indulge in amusements which are not of a religious character, and which look like desecration. Some travelling there must be, by the clergy in their work, by physicians, by the young visiting their parents and so keeping the Fifth Commandment, but still there is too much of it. On certain lines of railway Sunday is the heaviest day, and the women in the refreshment bars only get one Sunday in seven.

So with amusements. The difficulty is to know what to do with children. They must not be made to look upon it as an unhappy day, or it will do harm to their religious life. They must have amusements, but let them be quiet amusements. If five hundred boys at Rugby can do without playing their ordinary games on Sunday, the complaint that some people cannot live without playing lawn-tennis on Sunday will not hold.

The question is then: How are we to help to keep the day holy for ourselves and others? We should avoid dinner-parties and entertainments at home, because of the servants.

The Bishop's last subject at his Conferences in

the Rural Deaneries, in 1896, was "Church Reform," when he took the opportunity of dealing with the question of patronage. Two of his sayings are worth recording :—

There are many people who take much interest in drawing ideal pictures of what would make the Church perfect in their estimation. But in this country the plan always has been, and I venture to say always will be, to go step by step and take things as we find them, and improve them to the best of our ability till we have brought them to be what we deem sufficiently workable; and so reforms almost always disappoint the dreamers.

There is still a demand that the parishioners should have some voice in the selection of their pastor. But I fear it is not always the case that, if the parishioners do choose their own clergyman or advise the Bishop whom to choose, they select very wisely. Nay, I do not think it is always the case that they are content with their own choice two years afterwards. I have known case after case where a particular clergyman has been pressed upon me by the congregation, and I have appointed him accordingly. In one case I remember that four years afterwards the leading parishioners came to beg me to try whether I could not remove him somewhere else. . . . I have been twenty-six years a Bishop, and I have never once appointed a man without very careful inquiry into the feeling of the congregation, so far as I could ascertain it. Whatever the parishioners may say, I am quite certain that they are just as liable to make mistakes as the Bishop. One of the great objections to the parishioners having too much to say in the matter is obvious enough. It almost invariably happens that two parties are formed in the parish, and, necessarily, one of these parties must be disappointed in the appointment.

Dr. Temple's visitation charges were, for the most part, carefully worded epitomes of what he had impressed upon his clergy at their Ruridecanal Chapter meetings. He opened his primary visitation of the diocese on October 17, 1887, with a remarkable sermon on "Union with Christ" (St. John xv. 4), the charge itself consisting of a masterly exposition of 1 Corinthians xii., xiii., and xiv., in

which St. Paul speaks of all Church work in its various departments, of the spirit in which it should be done, and of the principles that should govern it.

Dr. Temple's utterances at Church Congresses during his London episcopate were mostly concerned with the practical problems of the day—educational and otherwise—on which his opinions are recorded elsewhere. There are three, however, that have a special value as dealing with subjects which possessed, in his case, a personal interest.

It is impossible to read his powerful analysis of the relation between Christian doctrine and Christian life, delivered at Folkestone in 1892, without perceiving that he was describing the principles which animated his whole career, and which he had evolved through his own lifelong experience. In reference to this utterance it was that Archbishop Benson wrote the following letter to Mrs. Temple:—

ADDINGTON PARK, CROYDON,
October 7, 1892.

MY DEAR MRS. TEMPLE—Please send me one line to say he is none the worse for his expedition.

Others gave very good papers and speeches, but *Samson* carried off the gates of Gaza. My devoted love to him.—
Yours affectionately, E. CANTUAR.

The following extract must suffice here. Commenting on the words,

For forms of faith let graceless zealots fight
He can't be wrong whose life is in the right,

the Bishop said:—

The truth which they express is contained in our Lord's words, "By their fruits ye shall know them." Our Lord Himself expressly declares that the fruits are the proof of the faith which men are holding, and He makes these fruits the test by which all their hearers should perpetually try them. By so doing, however, He does not mean that faith is indifferent, but He means that faith, if it be a real faith,

is certain to issue in the life of him that believes, and it will show itself there, and show itself unmistakably; and, so far from implying that it makes no difference what a man believes, His words really teach that it is of the very deepest importance that a man should hold his faith in truth. For, as He says Himself, it is the truth that makes us free; it is the truth that really makes men true servants of God, and it is in proportion as they hold the truth that men can really serve Him. . . . It is because the man believes in that which is holy, in that which is just, in that which is good, that he is enabled to live before his fellow-men a life which compels not only their admiration, but their reverence. . . . It is *not* true that "he can't go wrong whose life is in the right," when that is interpreted by such lives as many men live. The fact is that men are driven very often to this kind of conclusion by weariness of the controversy, of the wranglings, of the disputings, of the many strifes that have come out of a desire to learn the truth, when that desire has not been sanctified by the grace of God. For we do contend sometimes for the faith in such a spirit as to deny the very faith for which we contend. There is sometimes in our very zeal a kind of bitterness which contradicts the very highest principles of Christian practice. There is sometimes more than this; there creeps in all manner of self-will and a desire to maintain our own opinion, forgetful altogether of why that opinion has any value at all. There is sometimes controversy almost for the sake of controversy, and a delight in the contest as if the contest was itself a good, and not a means to the good, and a means much to be deprecated towards an end that we dare not sacrifice. And so it is that men, when they watch the disputes which rend asunder the Church, are even tempted to believe that no good can come out of such quarrelling as this. . . . It is a sad thing, but, nevertheless, it is no more than our Lord predicted when He said that He had come not to send peace, but a sword. He knew how the truth that He was revealing to mankind would of necessity be a provocation to much which He Himself condemned. . . . He knew that; and yet, for all that, His revelation was given to mankind; for, in spite of disputes, it is the truth, and the truth only, that can really hold fast man's life. . . . Often and often has it been the case that a man who lived respected and honoured because he lived a life regulated by high principle without religion, has proved the weakness of the stay on which he

rested by coming into some circumstances of real trial when for the first time he was obliged to say, "If my principles are true, all this present life must be given up, and I see not anything else before me: for I have no belief that there is another world at all." At such a moment the fundamental doctrine of the resurrection of the dead and the eternal judgment comes in to hold a man in spite of all his weakness, and give him a victory which his own strength could never have given him.

The power of doctrine over life must always depend upon the degree in which a man gives his will to his conscience, and not only holds fast the doctrine, but is resolute to live by it; for, if a man is not endeavouring to live by the doctrine that he holds, that man for certain does not really believe what he professes to believe—what he fancies, perhaps, that he does believe—and the doctrine that is dead within the soul produces no fruits whatever; and, in proportion as our Christian faith is dead, in that proportion always shall we give occasion to men to say, "All these questions of truth are of no value whatever: look to the life and care nothing whether the truth be clearly held or not." It is true, indeed, that there is such a thing as faith without any life to correspond; but that faith is dead indeed.

A reference to Bishop Temple's utterances at the Exeter Church Congress will be found at the close of the Exeter Memoir.

One other Congress utterance is worthy of note because of its connexion with a subject he had made his own—the subject of his Bampton lectures—the "Relations between Religion and Science." At Shrewsbury, in 1896, he contributed to an able discussion of the principle of evolution a statement of the case from the Christian standpoint which, for strength and lucidity, can hardly be surpassed.

There are two different ways of looking at evolution.¹ Evolution can be treated, on the one side, as if it were a kind of independent process going on of itself; and it is, no doubt, a very natural thing indeed that we should look upon

¹ See also Letter to his son William, Editor's Supplement, *infra*, p. 386.—ED.

all nature as working along its own lines by a sort of independent force given to it, we may say, by its Creator, but independent of that Creator. But, on the other hand, it is possible to look at evolution as being simply a method in which it pleases God to work, and I think that both ordinary Christians and scientific men would gain a great deal very frequently if they were willing to take that view of this important fact. I speak of evolution as a fact, because, whether it is as universal as men of science now generally regard it to be, or whether it is still, after all, but a partial process in the working out of nature, I think that it has established its claim to be as wide as the great bulk of all phenomena which are presented to us in this present world; and it is, therefore, natural enough that we should think of it as if it were practically, for all ordinary purposes, universal; nor do I object to scientific men always so treating it, any more than I object to scientific men treating the law of gravitation as being practically universal. . . . The Christian will naturally always look upon evolution as simply one of the ways in which God is doing the work which is visible before our eyes. "My Father worketh hitherto and I work," said our Lord; and so the Christian, if he studies this doctrine, will simply say, "You have set before me what was not so well known a hundred years ago; you have set before me a proof that God works in a particular manner which people formerly did not generally understand." When you look at the whole of evolution in that way, I think that you will find that the acceptance of it, so far from being a trouble to Christians, will, on the contrary, be in many cases a very great help to Christian thought and Christian life. There is so very much in the Gospel and in the kind of life that the Gospel requires of a man, and particularly in the idea of Christian progress—which is more insisted on in the New Testament than any other book that ever was written—that is akin to evolution, that it is very easy for us at all times to say, "When I look into my own life and my own character I see that God is working in me, but that the work is done, as a rule, very slowly and very quietly; my struggles and efforts towards rising nearer to Him being not, as a rule, characterised by sudden elevation of the soul, but by a slow and definite process of internal development; and that evolution which is within me I can well understand is also within the whole universe at large. I can well understand

that, instead of special interpositions, it has pleased our Heavenly Father to be always working according to a rule which we, when we see it, call "a law of nature."

Akin to his Congress and Ruridecanal addresses were the many admirable instructions which the Bishop gave to the lay-helpers of the diocese and other bodies. We select one or two here as illustrating the subjects with which he dealt and his manner of dealing with them.

The following remarks on the use of the study of Church history formed part of an introductory address to a course of lectures delivered by Dr. Creighton, then Bishop of Peterborough, in St. Paul's Cathedral, during the autumn of 1892.

Under the present dispensation, the Holy Spirit is given to every Christian to guide his ordinary life. The Holy Spirit does not supersede our natural faculties, but, as it were, taking His place behind the conscience, He makes the conscience His minister, and informs the conscience what is the Heavenly Father's will. The Holy Spirit no longer guarantees the infallibility of the individual, but He inspires the Church as a whole; and the Church, as a whole, has to study God's Word, to begin with, and then the history of the times that have gone by. . . . A study of that part of Church history which follows the New Testament is essential if we would know what are the rules by which the whole Church is to be governed. . . . For instance, the Holy Communion was always administered to Christians on their knees; but it is not spoken of in the New Testament as so administered. Church history, however, shows that the change was made very early, and that those who made it had precisely the same kind of authority for their action as the Jews had for changing the mode in which they observed the Passover.

Another very remarkable thing is fully explained by the history which follows the New Testament. The Epistles to the Corinthians show that in early days the Holy Communion followed upon what was called the Love Feast, but that the Apostle had to reprove the Christians at Corinth because it often happened that, after they had partaken of their joint meal, they were quite unfit for the

reception of the Great Mystery. The Epistles to the Corinthians explain the reason which led to a change in the occasion on which the administration took place. The Church soon found that, in order to protect the Holy Communion from the evil which St. Paul reprov'd, it was necessary to separate it altogether from the public meal. Such changes as these become intelligible at once upon a study of Church history. It will be found that for every successive change the Church has had some really good reason, and that it was led by a desire to bring about the more complete surrender of the individual soul to the Redeemer, a more entire reverence in ordinary public worship, the more thorough understanding of the great doctrines of the faith.

A third great advantage of the study of Church history is that it enables us to recognise the continuity of the life which pervades the Church from the earliest days to the present time. Down through all the ages the Holy Spirit has been, and is still, the guide of the Christian body. No doubt His secret influence and impulse have been now and then misunderstood, and sometimes they have not been really represented by what the Church has done. But, on the whole, the guidance has been such as to keep the Christian Church still a living thing from the beginning down to the present day—a life-giving organism which shall live on until the Lord shall come again. The study of Church history tends both to deepen our sense of the unity of the Church from the beginning, and to broaden our attitude towards persons who may differ from us.

With one other important utterance this chapter may be fitly closed.

On January 16, 1894, the Bishop gave a striking lecture to the clergy of the diocese at Sion College on "Faith." He began by referring at some length to a conversation upon Justification by Faith which he, when a young scholar at Balliol, once had with "Ideal" Ward, then a Fellow of the College and considerably his senior. Ward quoted the definition of faith given by Coleridge in the beginning of his *Confessions of an Inquiring Spirit*: "Faith subsists in the synthesis

of the reason and the individual will," a definition which the Bishop took as the text of his lecture.

It was not (he owned) a definition that would have been accepted in the last century, nor one which was generally to be found in the writers of Christian evidences ; but, while it had been assumed that faith was the act of the intellect only, he contended that to make it merely an intellectual act would be to lower the nature of faith itself. Such a theory was, he said, inconsistent with the nature of man, between whose various faculties and powers a sharp distinction could not really be drawn. The tendency to separate the intellectual and the will forces was, he felt sure, a mistaken one. The intellect could not act in its fulness without the will, nor could the will act in its fulness without the intellect, nor indeed could either act without the affections. But, still further, the tendency of this attempted separation of the intellect from the will, and the assigning of faith to the intellect entirely, was always towards laying the whole stress of faith upon external evidence. The intellect taken by itself dealt with external evidence more easily than any other, and consequently, wherever that notion of faith had either consciously or unconsciously prevailed, there had been always a tendency to base faith entirely upon miracles, and to make them the one conclusive proof of the truth of God's revelation, or especially of that part of His revelation from which we derived our Christian knowledge. That, however, was no sure foundation ; for it was a resting, not upon miracles as the real basis, but upon the historical evidence of those miracles ; and there, of course, there necessarily came in the fact that the judgment upon miracles belonged entirely to the ordinary intellect. The man who was the best judge of such evidence was not necessarily a good man or a spiritual man ; he was simply an intellectual man who could balance one kind of testimony against another.

The Bishop then said that

Faith might begin in various ways. It might begin within or without ; but if it was to be a permanent thing, if it was to be supreme over life, then it must find its root at last within the soul. Faith must be a total, not a partial—a continuous, not a desultory—energy. Faith must be light,

a form of knowing, a beholding of truth. The anchor of faith was a true belief in the moral law, and the moral law must necessarily have a supreme personality. It was the voice which governed the man from within, and at the same time asserted its supremacy over everything else.

This analysis of faith was then applied by the Bishop to the Christian Faith.

The acceptance of God, the acceptance of Christ, the acceptance of the Bible, the acceptance of the doctrines taught in the Bible, and the acceptance of those facts which were bound up with those doctrines—that was the faith alike of the great divine and the uneducated peasant. The one might be able to see the reasons of his faith, and the other might not; but both alike had real evidence upon which their faith rested, in that absolute firm foundation which God had given to every man in his own soul.

☞ In the following chapter, which deals with the Bishop's views on education and the functions of the Christian Church as a national institution, we hope to show by extracts, selected from his utterances on various occasions, how consistent was his view of the relations that united in one indissoluble Christian bond the three great ideas involved in his chief watchwords—CHURCH, BIBLE, SCHOOL.

CHAPTER IV

EDUCATIONAL WORK IN LONDON

Teaching University for London—King's College—Elementary education—Religious teaching—Home influence—The religious character of the teacher—Use and abuse of tests—Church schools—The clergyman in the schools—Educational measures—The Bible—The proposed Gresham University.

THE dissatisfaction that had long been felt with the University of London, which had become an exclusively examining body, culminated in an agitation started in 1887 by University College and King's College for the creation of a Teaching University for London. In the summer of 1889 a Commission under the late Earl of Selborne examined a large number of expert witnesses, and presented a report to the effect that the general case for a Teaching University had been made out, but that, rather than create a new institution side by side with the old one, the University of London should be invited to modify its constitution with a view to the introduction of the teaching element into its functions.

The evidence tendered by the Bishop of London was of great value, and had a marked influence on the Report of the Commission.¹ It was charac-

¹ The following extracts from the Report of the Commissioners indicate this (sec. 7 and sec. 11, latter parts):—

“The examinations of the London University, as at present con-

terised by that strong note of common-sense trained by practical experience which always inspired the Bishop's utterances.

He laid stress, in the first instance, on the comparative worthlessness of examinations considered as a separate thing from the teaching they were supposed to test.

They had to consider (said the Bishop) what was the most effective instrument for giving the highest kind of education; and he had no hesitation in saying that it was contact with great masters of the subjects to be taught, and that there was nothing else which could supply the place of that contact of mind with mind, nor any other stimulus to the intellect that could be compared with it.

They had also to remember that time was a most important element in true study. They could not get the true results of study unless a sufficient time was allowed for the study to sink into the mind, and everything that tended to dispense with that most important requisite made the study of far less value. It was one of the special distinctions between good study and what was commonly called "cram," that "cram" was, generally speaking, study contracted into as short a space of time as possible.

The examination could not, of itself, test what was of most importance to the student, viz., the degree in which his mind had been formed to deal with knowledge or to acquire new knowledge.

Moreover, an examination which was made the be-all and end-all of a university's work had other serious disadvantages. It had a great tendency to encourage the study, not of the subjects, but of the examiners.

If any examiner had written a book, those who were to be examined by him were quite certain to be very careful

ducted, are said to be out of touch with the teaching of the Colleges (King's College, London, and University), and to tend, not so much to test the proficiency of the candidates in what they have then learnt, as to divert their attention from the instruction given within the Colleges to whatever may be discoverable as to the views of the examiners from time to time appointed . . ."

"The existing University, as long as it is a mere examining and degree-giving body for students, collegiate and non-collegiate, from all parts of the kingdom and even from the colonies, is not a *London University* in any practical sense."

to get up that book. All papers that had been printed—papers of questions given in an examination—were made leading subjects of study. They were, in reality, a hindrance rather than a help to the true acquisition of educated knowledge. A young man got hold of a number of papers, in order that he might see what was the style of question that he would be asked. In proportion to his ability would be the mischief that had been done to him. If he was able enough to catch from the papers the style of the examiner, and to study with a view to meeting questions of that character, it practically almost destroyed the value of his study, it necessarily narrowed his mind very much; and not only so, but it took off his attention from that which was most valuable, because most living, in the study itself!

The examination for a degree ought to be such as should test the knowledge of learners both in quality and in quantity. It ought to be thoroughly in harmony with the teaching, and much more than half the value of the examination would be altogether lost unless the teaching and the examination were in such relations to each other that the examination could be considered as a part of the teaching itself.

The examination ought to follow the teaching, and not the teaching to follow the examination. If they insisted (as was practically the case in the London University system) on subordinating the teaching to the examination, they would find that the best teachers—the men of real independence and originality of thought—would not work with hearty interest in such a system. The great teachers must needs feel what Niebuhr felt when he said to his class, “Ye are my wings.” He must delight in the consciousness that those who were learning from him by their sympathy in his teaching and by their appreciation of what he said were bearing him up in all his work.

But such pupils as a mere examining body would attract would seldom care to go through a long course if they could pass the examination quite as satisfactorily in a short course. They would not care to be so taught that their minds should have, not only the knowledge, but the literary or scientific habit formed in them, if they could pass the examination without troubling themselves with any such matters. A very large number of students were certain to say, “How can I get this coveted degree with the least expenditure of pains and trouble and money and time?”

The Bishop concluded his evidence by declaring his conviction that the University of London had unfitted itself for the work that was most wanted—the work of the highest value to university students. In his opinion, the two duties—that of being an examining body for all kinds of instruction without any reference to how the knowledge had been obtained, and that of being a teaching body which should give the highest possible teaching, and should stamp with its degrees those who had received that teaching, and received it in the best possible way—were not compatible with one another.¹

Questioned as to the desirability of establishing a theological faculty in the proposed Teaching University, the Bishop expressed his belief that there could not be such a faculty formed which should be independent of special creeds and opinions. His view was that a theological faculty was not essential, and that it might be excluded altogether. At the same time, he did not think it would be possible to arrange for a divided faculty—embodying (say) Roman, Anglican, and Nonconformist tenets within its scope—such as existed in Germany.²

As a witness, the Bishop, of course, represented King's College, and fully concurred in the views most ably set forth before this and the subsequent (1894) Commission by Dr. Wace, then Principal of the College and now Dean of Canterbury.³

With reference to this evidence, Bishop Welldon (then Headmaster of Harrow), who was a member of Lord Selborne's Commission, writes as follows:—

If I were to say when and where I saw him (Dr. Temple) at his best, I should refer to his evidence before the Royal Commission in 1888. The provision of University teaching

¹ Evidence before the Royal Commission of 1889, section 534.

² *Ibid.* sections 552-554.

³ *Ibid.* section 316.

in London was a subject he had made his own. But on education he was everywhere a master. Two sentences of his evidence I recall especially as showing a luminous educational wisdom. *A most important element in true study is always time. You cannot get the results of study unless a sufficient time is allowed for the study to sink into the mind ; and everything that tends to dispense with that most important requisite makes the study of far less value.* And again : *The examination ought to follow the teaching, and not the teaching to follow the examination.*

A reasonable time having been allowed to the Senate and Convocation of the University of London in which to apply for a new Charter embodying the changes in its constitution recommended by Lord Selborne's Commission, and no such application having been made, the petitions of the two Colleges were taken into consideration by the Privy Council, which in the result approved a Draft Charter of a new Teaching University, founded on these petitions, to be called "The Gresham University." But before the Charter thus approved could take effect, it had to lie on the table of the Houses of Parliament for some weeks, and an opposition to it was set on foot, due in great measure to the Victoria University of Liverpool and Manchester. Opposition from such a quarter seemed to many persons peculiarly unhandsome, as the Victoria University itself was only twenty years old, and none of the old universities of the United Kingdom opposed the grant. But Mr. A. J. Balfour, who had lately succeeded Mr. W. H. Smith as Leader of the House of Commons, was member for a division of Manchester, and could not be expected to oppose his constituents in such a matter. Consequently a third Commission was appointed in 1894 to consider the proposed Charter, under the presidency of Earl Cowper, K.G., and the Bishop again gave valuable evidence. He strongly advocated

the collegiate system as being by far the most effective for what he considered of greater importance than even the advancement of knowledge by original research, viz., the higher education of the youth of London. He expressed his conviction that the collegiate system could alone supply that steady discipline which was essential to true education.

'The young men (he said) want not only to be taught, but to be trained—to be trained intellectually; and intellectual training involves a moral training—training in perseverance, in observation, in self-restraint, in all those moral qualities which enable a man to concentrate his intellectual faculties . . . The kind of discipline I mean is not merely the discipline of rule, but the discipline which necessarily brings the students of the teacher or professor into close personal relations with him and with each other. By this means they acquire an intimacy with each other and a considerable amount of *esprit de corps*, and this intercourse and spirit of fellowship have a highly educating effect in themselves. . . . In such a country as ours the most important thing we can aim at is to penetrate all occupations and all the educated classes with what we may call liberal culture; and this liberal culture implies that there shall be a great deal of real supervision and control over students, such as the simple professorial system will never give.¹

The Bishop's view of the value of the religious tests in connexion with King's College was clear and emphatically expressed. He thought they could not be given up without undermining the purpose of the College and the express intention of its founders; and he thought that the solution of the religious difficulty lay, *not* in the direction of abolishing tests for distinctively Church or Non-conformist colleges, but of incorporating denominational colleges and institutions, as they were,

¹ Evidence before Gresham University Commission, 8021, 8028. See Letters to the Lord Mayor and to Mr. C. S. Roundell, printed in the Appendix, or at the end of this chapter.

into the University.¹ He did not desire that the University, as such, should belong to the Church of England or adopt any religious complexion whatsoever, but he saw no difficulty in admitting within the pale of the University Colleges that were Jewish, Roman Catholic, Anglican, or Non-conformist.

When asked how such an arrangement could be made compatible with the creation of a Theological Faculty for the whole University, he expressed a strong opinion in favour of the formation of a Faculty of *Theological Science*, as opposed to Dogmatic or Doctrinal Theology—a Faculty which might offer common ground for adherents of all Creeds in the range of subjects included within its scope—a Faculty in which there should be no test imposed whatever. The only safeguard he suggested was that every college should have the power of forbidding its students to attend the teaching of particular professors.

In defending the Anglican character of King's College against the suggestion that it would be better to secularise that institution, the Bishop said that though, in secular and undenominational places of education, there was an unwritten law that it was an improper and wrong thing that any man should use his position as a teacher to propagate his own religious opinions, yet there were certainly a great many men who used such positions—some of them very high positions—to inculcate Agnosticism.

In their report the Commissioners recommended the formation of a Faculty of Theological Science,²

¹ Editor's Supplement, *infra*, p. 653.—Ed.

² The Report of the Commissioners, in proposing that the University should include the six Faculties of Arts, Science, Medicine, Law, Theology, and Music, added the following note upon the Faculty of Theology:—

“The University of London is by its Charter prohibited from con-

as suggested by the Bishop, and the incorporation of the following denominational Colleges as Schools of the University: King's College, Hackney College, New College, the Presbyterian College, Regent's Park College, Cheshunt College, Richmond College.

Dr. Temple had been, previously to his action in connexion with the London University Scheme, a member of the Royal Commission on Education presided over by Viscount Cross in 1888, concerning which Lord Cross writes :—

I can only (after so many years) speak to the Bishop's earnestness in the cause of religious instruction, and to the manner in which he never failed to give attendance at all

ferring degrees in Theology ; and no Theological Faculty or Degree is provided for in the Gresham Charter, although King's College has for many years had a considerable Theological Department connected with it. The Divinity degrees now attainable in England are practically restricted to the clergy of the Established Church. It appears to us that students of Divinity outside that class should have the opportunity of obtaining the stamp of a degree upon their studies. In the course of our inquiry a strong desire was expressed by the representatives of various Theological Colleges in and near London, connected with the Church of England and with other religious denominations, that the scope of the University might be enlarged so as to include a Faculty and a Degree in Theological Science, a term chosen by them to indicate distinctly that the Degree had relation solely to the various branches of learning related to the study of theology, and implied no test or profession of faith. A similar proposal received the support of the Convocation of the University of London. Concurring, as we do, in the opinion that it is practicable to conduct theological examinations on the basis proposed, and that the recognition of the subject by the University must give a valuable stimulus to the deeper study of this important branch of learning, we propose that power should be given to the University of London to teach, examine, and confer Degrees in Theological Science on the same footing as in other Faculty subjects. (Report, pp. xv-xvi. v. 13 (a).)"

The subjects to be included in the curriculum of the Faculty of Theological Science were enumerated in the following paragraph of the Report (p. xlv. v.):—

"We recommend that provision should be made, either by the University or by the admitted schools, for the study of the books and languages of the Old and New Testament Scriptures, including Rabbinic, Hebrew and languages cognate to Hebrew, and Patristic Greek, and of the following subjects :—Ecclesiastical History ; History of Doctrines ; the Philosophy of Religion ; the Comparative History of Religions ; Ethical Systems ; Psychology and Logic."

IV EDUCATIONAL WORK IN LONDON 81

our meetings in spite of his numerous engagements elsewhere; and to the support which I invariably received from him in conducting a very long inquiry by a Commission which was, as I think, most unfortunately composed of partisans on either side who could never possibly agree.

The Bishop was offered a seat on the Royal Commission on Secondary Education, but contented himself with appearing as a witness.¹

But if the London Episcopate of Dr. Temple was thus marked by his interest in, and practical contribution to, the great question of higher education, his exertions in the cause of elementary education were still more constant and energetic. The principles he advocated were always clear and consistent; and it may be better worth while to state them here than to fill up space by an exhaustive record of the transient phases through which his action passed in relation to educational legislation.

He detested the system of "cram," so commonly adopted all over the country, as fatal to the wholesome upbringing of the young, and strongly deprecated the trespassing of secondary teaching into the department of elementary training.

I should like to get some legislative enactment simply for the purpose of relieving the elementary schools from the present temptation to run up so very high—a temptation which is too much for the strength of the School Board for London. When I was at Rugby, if a boy came to be examined for entrance into the school, and I found that in the preparatory school, very often at about the age of thirteen, he had been for the last two years reading Thucydides, I knew immediately that the preparatory school was a bad one. That never failed, in my recollection, as a test that they were running on too far with their preparation. The boys were not well taught, and I used to come now and again on boys who had been reading Thucydides and who

¹ See letter from the Right Hon. J. Bryce, M.P., Editor's Supplement, p. 648.—Ed.

had not the smallest notion of the difficulties of Thucydides, simply because they were not up to understanding the matter at all. It is the same thing with all education. There is no greater mistake in education than to run too fast with regard to your subjects. If you want your education to be good you must look to the beginnings, you must make them really sound, and then you may afterwards go on and develop them as much as you please in accordance with the growth of the faculties of the child. Pushing the boys faster than their natural growth will allow must really be a blunder, of which it is difficult to say whether it is more mischievous or more plausible; because there are hundreds of people who really think that by teaching children what they cannot understand, they have made a great step forward in education. Nowadays it is, unhappily, "the thing" to teach them thus.

His views on elementary education were based upon the fourfold consideration:—(1) that morality cannot be successfully inculcated or maintained without religion; (2) that Christian home influence is the first essential in the teaching of religion; (3) that the religious character of the school teacher is of vital importance if religious teaching is to be effectual; (4) that the religious training of the young is an indispensable part of the Church's mission and work. The following extracts from speeches and addresses delivered on various occasions furnish a brief summary of his convictions on these points:—

(1) MORALITY AND RELIGION.¹—I believe that, in fighting the battle of religious education, we are fighting the battle of the State and of the Country quite as much as we are fighting the battle of the Church. I believe that that kind of moral training which follows upon true religious teaching and true religious discipline is of far more value than any other moral training that can be given; and I am confident that, if the moral training goes down, this country will have to suffer for it in course of time, and that nothing can befall the nation so disastrous to its future prosperity as that its

¹ Spoken at the London Diocesan Conference, 1894.

moral character should be generally lowered, that its principles should be called in question, and that men everywhere should say that the idea of justice and truth and self-sacrifice for great objects was an antiquated idea, and that the interested and selfish aims of each man for himself ought to have the prominent place in the regulation of his conduct. No man will venture to say that I am wrong in making this assertion, but many are ready enough to say that the means that we take to secure it are not the only means, and that they can find better teaching elsewhere. I heard myself a great leader of education say that the very thought of *duty* was enough to hold children in their proper place before God—that the thought of duty, if it could be maintained, was enough to carry a man through life, without encumbering his mind with any religious principles at all. Yes, the thought of duty, if you can indeed inculcate it, and if you are so blind that you cannot see that the thought of duty turns upon the thought of God, and that it is in proportion as duty gathers itself round devotion to God and devotion to His revelation and His redemption that it has its permanent hold upon the mass of mankind, and that nothing else will implant that idea of duty in the soul of the great mass of men except the religious teaching which we give in the Name of the Saviour, and which we bring down to ordinary moral practice in duty to our neighbour,—the thought of duty is indeed something very noble beyond most other thoughts; but its hold upon men turns always upon their relations to their Maker, and, without that, in vain will you endeavour to make them faithful to a mere abstraction which they very soon begin to question the reality of, and which they very soon begin to put aside as having no real power, although it may have a great name.

I do not myself believe¹ in the possibility of a moral education without religion. I know there is a great deal to be said, and plausibly said, on behalf of it. I know very well that men who have had the advantage of a religious education themselves do succeed in later years, sometimes, in separating the moral from the religious out of what they have themselves retained, and fancy that, in dealing with the rising generation, they may give them the moral and leave the religious to take care of itself. I do not believe in the possibility of that. I do not believe that, if you leave out

¹ Spoken at the London Diocesan Conference, 1889.

the thought of God—if you leave out that kind of reverence which is created in the child's mind by the sense of a Supreme Ruler, of a Supreme Father, of a Father who loves him, but who is nevertheless so absolutely holy that He demands that we shall ever be endeavouring to be holy too—I do not believe, if you leave out from the child's mind this sense of reverence, you will find very much strength left in any conception you may impress upon him of right and wrong in the abstract. I am ready always to admit that if you take the philosophy of religion, and trace back to their sources those principles from which religion comes, philosophically, and in the order of ideas, morality comes before religion, and that the sense of the eternal difference between right and wrong is the root of that faith by which we believe in God who is the Author of all religion. I admit that if you are thinking simply how you can put the Science of religion, as it were, into logical shape, you begin with morality and rise to religion afterwards. But I am deeply convinced that, in all education of the young, to be worth anything at all, the concrete always precedes the abstract, and that to attempt to teach a child abstract morality with the idea of teaching religion afterwards is utterly futile. In dealing with the mind of a little child you must begin with the idea of God's love and of the Saviour who died for us on the Cross; you must begin with the religious thought, out of which will come the force by which morality is afterwards to be maintained; for, if you begin in any other way, you will find your moral teaching is altogether weak and unable to bear the strain put upon it by the constant difficulties which beset religious belief. With that belief in my mind, I look upon it as an imperative duty to do our utmost to maintain in their fullest efficiency all those schools which make religious instruction the first thing, which bear upon the very face of them the proclamation that they desire to realise the precept of our Lord to "seek first the Kingdom of God and His righteousness."

(2) HOME INFLUENCE.—Then let us note that there is a plain lesson for Christian parents. All Christians must remember that it is in the hands of all parents to confer the highest blessing. The first duty lies in their hands—it is in its essence a permanent thing. As the child learns to walk because he wants to do what he sees others do, and as in the same way a child learns to speak, so must he be educated in perceiving a distinction between right and wrong. His

conscience must be trained to perform its moral and spiritual functions aright—and that from the very first. No school can awaken the conscience like a religious home. Schools may add to the teaching afterwards, but it is of paramount importance that there should be a religious home to start with. Let parents think of this duty, and set the example of a truly religious life; let them by their lives and examples set a pattern of purity, courage, and truth, and, above all, a sense of the Presence of God and of the Love of our Lord Jesus Christ. They have not only to teach their children to see, but to practise, the truths that they learn; and it would be difficult to find a better summary than that which is set forth in the Catechism; for there is inculcated throughout it the duty of the teacher to do his utmost, not only to teach Christian truths by heart, but to teach them so that they may become a law of life—eternal principles—which shall continue to govern us to the end of our days.

Religious Teaching¹ rests for its efficiency on two main conditions: the intellectual clearness and the earnest conviction of the teacher. If the teaching be not clear and distinct, it has a loose hold on the mind; it is liable to be misunderstood by the learner; it is liable to be easily misrepresented by the assailant; it is liable to be forgotten, or remembered so obscurely as to lose its force. Now the Board School system excludes, as a rule, all the well-known means for giving clearness and precision to the teaching. It excludes catechisms, creeds, and similar formularies which have been constructed for this purpose. The Church must supply what is thus deficient or the children will undoubtedly suffer. How many generations of Englishmen have learnt to govern their conduct by "My duty to my neighbour!" And those who repudiate this, wish very much to have some other formulary to put in its place. How many of us are held fast, almost unconsciously, by the Apostles' Creed! It is all contained in the Bible, but how difficult to remember it if we are taken all through the New Testament and these fundamental truths are left to be gathered as we go! Those who object to use it, because it is not put together in one place in the Bible, proceed on the assumption that our Lord created His Church, but would not entrust it even with the power of framing manuals for teaching. It is impossible for us to be content without

¹ Primary Visitation, November 1887.

supplying such an elementary deficiency in the setting forth of the truth.

(3) RELIGIOUS CHARACTER OF THE TEACHER.—But still more does the efficiency of religious teaching depend on the earnest conviction of the teacher. Now there is not the same security for the religious character of the teacher in the Board Schools as in our own Church schools. That he should be a religious man is not the main consideration in choosing him. He may be an unbeliever; or, if not an unbeliever altogether, he may disbelieve the Bible. If he be a man of good moral character and a first-rate teacher and organiser he may be elected, and yet have little sense of religion. Now for a man with no religious belief to give religious instruction is *simply impossible*. Children are very quick to see—to feel—if a teacher does not himself believe what he is teaching them, and a man who does not really believe may make his scholars know what is in the Bible and pass a good examination in it, but his teaching will assuredly be without full religious influence. In the Board Schools it is impossible to prevent this from sometimes happening.

The Bishop was clear in his views about the use and abuse of tests.

The current that has set in against our Church schools of recent years is to a very great degree the reaction from the mistake that once was made by those who endeavoured to force all persons who undertook any civil function whatever to accept the teaching of the Church, whether they believed it or not; and men, no doubt, in former days were tied down by tests which it was wrong to impose upon them. I have no doubt that the legislation which got rid of many of those tests was a righteous legislation. But now comes the reaction; and because tests out of place have been condemned by the Nation and by the Legislature and, I may add, by the Church herself—because these tests out of place have been pronounced out of place—there is now a sort of notion spread about that tests are never in place at all, and that you must get rid of them even where they are wanted. What can be more ridiculous? The requirement that once was made that before admission to any municipal office a man must come to the Holy Communion in the Church was truly a most mischievous thing, discreditable both to the Church and to the State; but the wrong in this case was

IV EDUCATIONAL WORK IN LONDON 87

perfectly clear. It consisted in the fact that the exclusion of all but communicants in the Church from such office was unreasonable. A man was undoubtedly quite as capable of doing his duty in a municipal office if he refused the test as if he submitted to it. The test in that case, and in other similar cases, had nothing whatever to do with the duties required. But to push the condemnation to the length of saying that, if a man is to be appointed to an office, no inquiry is to be made into his fitness for that office is hardly consistent with common sense. It is said that if a man is to teach arithmetic he shall pass a test, he shall be examined, he shall show that he knows it, he shall show that he can teach it. If he is to teach grammar he is to pass a test, he is to be examined, he is to show that he knows what he is about, that he knows the principles of grammar, that he knows how to handle those principles in instructing children. But if he is to teach the highest of all subjects there is immediately a protest that you are not to examine him at all, that you are not to test him, that you are to take him just as he is, and, whether he can teach it or not, he is to be entrusted with the teaching. I say that this is not merely an erroneous but an absurd assertion, that it is far more than a mere error or mistake, and that it is self-contradictory. To tell a man that he is to be giving instruction on any subject whatever without ascertaining whether or not he is able to give it well, or the reverse of well, is contrary, I do not say to careful and thoughtful reason, but even to most elementary common sense. No tests! We put tests to all those who are to be ministers of the Gospel in the Church; and, so far as I know, as a general rule the Nonconformists themselves do precisely the same thing in the administration of their own work.

Why, then, do we attach so much value to the Church schools? Is it not because of their Church character? Now the Church character of these schools mainly depends upon the appointment of the teachers. Some importance, no doubt, must be assigned to the course of religious instruction prescribed, but, after all, no rules prescribing the kind of religious instruction to be given can be compared for a moment with the character of the teachers in determining what the school is to be like. Our schools are Church schools because we appoint the teachers without any interference, and are bound to see that they are religious Churchmen.

(4) **THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE CLERGY.**—Let it be always remembered that although the Bible is the great text-book of religious instruction for the world, the Lord did not first have the Bible written and then send forth His apostles to lecture on it: He created His Church; He sent forth His Church; He inspired His Church; and that part of the Bible which is most precious to us came afterwards. He sent forth *men* to do the work. The New Testament is the great instrument by which they are to do it, but the Church that He created is the agent to use that instrument; and it is to invert altogether the order of instruction which the Lord has given us if we suppose that the instrument is to do the work by itself.¹

I have often heard it asked why clergymen are not satisfied with their own proper work, the Church and the pulpit, and are not content to leave to others the question of the education of the children. But in this question a clergyman is asked to give up what he feels to be a vital part of his own work, viz. to lay hold of the children, to make them understand the truth of God, to make them understand God's love; gradually, as they grow older, to draw them into fuller and fuller communion with the Church and religious life. Why, it is so important a part of a clergyman's work that there are not a few amongst us who will be prepared to say that hardly anything else we have to do can rank above it.

The Church school is one of the hands of the parish priest, it is one of the modes in which he works his parish. Of course he can get on to a certain extent without a school. He can visit the people in their homes, he can talk to them in church; but, without the school in his own hands, he cannot deal as effectively as he desires with those who are growing up all round him—the children of his flock whom he must regard as of the very gravest importance to his own particular work and to the work of the Church at large. He has the future of those children before him, and he knows the difference it will make how they are brought up when young. To say to him, Cannot you leave that—leave their education—to other agencies? is like asking him to give up a part of his very life. He lives for this very work; it is the most serious thing. And, if I turn from thinking of the priest in his parish to thinking of the parish itself,

¹ London Diocesan Conference, 1890.

IV EDUCATIONAL WORK IN LONDON 89

surely it does not require any argument to show that it makes an enormous difference whether these children are brought up under religious conditions or not. They will have the power, when they grow up, of infecting society for good or bad; and, as they grow up, their characters must tell very largely on the tone of the Church in the course of perhaps the next ten years. Can we quietly let that go? If I turn from the work of the parish to this great Metropolis, we see how easy it is everywhere to walk away from spiritual instruction, and we are endeavouring to meet the needs of the case. We are building more churches, and sending out more clergymen, and we shall continue to do so. But what folly to do all this, and to allow those who will be members of our flocks by and by to grow up without receiving the religious preparation that is so necessary. What is the use of doing all this if we neglect to give them instruction while still of tender age and when they are most susceptible to the influences and education that ought to be given them? . . . Board Schools do generally give religious instruction, and, so far as it goes, very good religious instruction; but I do not believe the School Board would long continue to give it if the Church schools were to be extinguished and the country were to settle down to the opinion that nobody really cared about religious instruction for the great mass of the people.¹

For some time the Bishop took no prominent part in the elementary education question in its political bearings. He separated himself, indeed, from the policy of the advanced Church party on the London School Board; but at the Exeter Church Congress, 1894, though he adhered to his opinion of the unwisdom of that policy, he expressed his belief that the 1870 compromise, which had for many years worked fairly well, was being "wrecked by the so-called Progressive School in such a way as to make the religious instruction either such as could hardly be called religious instruction at all, or such as the great body of Churchmen would strongly condemn." He there-

¹ London Diocesan Conference, 1892. [See also "Exeter" Memoir, vol. i. p. 346; and Editor's Supplement, *infra*, pp. 645, 646 and 673.—En.]

fore approved of the aims of the Church party on the School Board, while deprecating their methods as a tactical mistake.

A pronounced advocate of State aid as opposed to Rate aid,¹ he declared at the Shrewsbury Church Congress in 1896 that though he was still a supporter of State aid, he was prepared to yield his own views in deference to the general opinion of the Church as expressed by the Convocations and the House of Laymen of both provinces.²

The *Daily News* credited Dr. Temple with having been, through Archbishop Benson, Lord Salisbury's adviser on the Education Bill of 1896. The Bishop considered that this Bill was "animated throughout with a plain desire to do justice to the Church."

There were (he considered) two main characteristics which ran through it, one of them being educational and the other religious. (1) There was a recognition of the important position which religion must needs hold in all education, such as he could not find in any previous legislation; because in all previous legislation it had been left

¹ In June 1895 he had written, in contradistinction to the views of the ten northern Bishops: "If our brethren in the North find this burden too heavy, I entreat them to consider whether it will not be better for the Church that they should surrender some of their schools to the School Boards, than that they should put the body of Church schools on the slippery slope of support from the rates."

² "I, for my part, have my own opinions, and I have not hesitated on late occasions to give them full expression as far as I have had opportunity. . . . But, nevertheless, neither do I hesitate to say that in such a crisis as this I care much more for the unity of the Church than for any opinions of my own. Our security in the future will depend really much more upon the spirit which animates the Church as a body than upon particular details of any measure that shall be passed; and if the body of Churchmen, calculating, as I have done, come to a different conclusion than mine, I shall be the very first to throw myself with all my heart into the line which is marked out when the time comes for definite resolutions to be taken."

[A few weeks subsequently to making the above declaration, he formally accepted, when presiding over a Special Committee of the National Society, the principle of the application of Rate aid to Voluntary Schools. See Editor's Supplement, p. 660, footnote 2. —Ed.]

entirely to the School Boards to determine what religious instruction should be given in their schools, and there had been no recognition of the necessity of appealing to any other authority than the School Board. . . . (2) Instead of leaving a school to bestow religious instruction according to the discretion of the managers of the school, the State would now step in and say, "If the parents demand it, you must give it—you must make proper arrangements for its being given."¹

It would be impossible to do justice to Dr. Temple's principles of education if we were to leave unnoticed his oft-advocated views on the study of the Bible.

The present Bishop of London tells of a most able and illuminating lecture delivered by his predecessor to a thousand men at the Oxford House on "Conscience and the Bible," in which it was demonstrated that Christ not only satisfied the conscience, but educated while He satisfied it. A secularist lecturer present stated in the subsequent discussion that Christ had borrowed all He taught from the philosopher Pythagoras. In reply the Bishop said—"I have read all we have that Pythagoras is supposed to have written, and I do not think it would cover a single page of the New Testament. Perhaps my friend there has discovered much more?" The poor man on leaving the lecture-room had to face the ridicule of his mates, who shouted after him, "What price Pythagoras?"

His accustomed line of teaching about Holy Scripture was as follows :—

Let us ask ourselves (he would say) what it is that makes the Bible different from other books.

In the first place, the most striking thing about it is its authority—the authority it continues to exercise from age to age over the consciences of faithful and religious-minded men. Its authority may be disputed and questioned and set

¹ Speech to the London Diocesan Conference, 1896.

aside by individuals here and there; but, for all that, it continues to lay hold of the consciences of the great mass who have religious feelings in their hearts. The authority with which it speaks is, in itself, precisely of the same nature as in our Lord's life was ascribed to His teaching. What is the nature of that authority? It very much comes to this: when I read any other book in the world—the best book, a book full of religious thought and feeling—yet, nevertheless, somehow or other I do not feel that my conscience is bound to submit; I feel, on the contrary, that my conscience is bound to judge. I read, for instance, the writings of some great father of the early Church—St. Augustine or St. Chrysostom—and I am much edified and learn a great deal. But, for all that, if I feel that in any one particular it goes against my conscience, I do not consider I am bound in any way to submit. But somehow or other when I read the Bible I feel I am in the presence of God, and that I must listen to its voice with deep reverence. It may be that my conscience cannot always accept what I read; but, nevertheless, the authority of the Book is such over the soul of man that the inference is that I am mistaken about my opinion of what is right, or else I am mistaken in the interpretation I have put upon the Book, and therefore must study it still more. The Book all through carries with it the sense that God is present to the soul of the writer of its words, and that he dares not pretend he has received what he has not received. . . .

Then, again, the Bible is the one book which has done more than any book ever written to develop, to enlighten, and to enlarge the conscience¹—that conscience which is God's messenger to man. It does not require a great deal of self-examination to say that whatever is highest, best, and most heavenly in our thoughts comes, directly or indirectly, from this Book; and, if this is true of us as individuals, still more true is it of the human race. Let us look at the effect of this Book upon the moral standard of the human race. There have been books written to improve the moral standard of the race by religious heathen. No man can read Plato without finding that there is a great deal which lifts him very distinctly above the ordinary level of the people of those days. So it may be said of Aristotle and Epictetus. But, when we compare the effect of these writings with

¹ See Editor's Supplement, pp. 470-472.—Ed.

the Bible, they come to absolutely nothing. The moral standard of the world has been perpetually drawn higher by the power and influence of the Bible. There are things which our forefathers looked upon as permissible which we consider wrong. What has made us consider them wrong? Unquestionably the influence of the Bible. There was a time when slavery was a recognised institution which, even in the New Testament, the Church was not authorised to sweep away at once. We now say that slavery is an institution which ought not to exist. But it is no exaggeration to say that it never would have been condemned at all if the Bible had never been written. It is no exaggeration to say that the great advance in the knowledge of right and wrong has come out of that Book directly. And I have no doubt that some things which are tolerated now will not be tolerated some generations hence, because the slow perpetual influence of this Book will gradually educate men's consciences until such things will be done away with.

Then again, thirdly, there is its wonderful breadth, its wonderful adaptation to the needs of man, its catholicity, whereby somehow or other there is not a soul that lives that does not find something to meet his spiritual nature and needs. It is a common remark amongst Christians who read a daily portion of Scripture that they constantly find a passage which meets their own particular need in the course of the day.

And there is yet a fourth characteristic in the Bible, which is as striking as any I have mentioned, and that is its wonderful freshness. I read other books, but there invariably comes a time in reading other books when I feel I have read them enough, when I feel they can teach me no more, and when I seem to have exhausted them. But it is just the opposite with the Bible. The more a man reads it the more he feels the power of expressed revelation. Every now and then to a constant reader there rises before his eyes a new thing he has not previously seen.

I might mention other characteristics of the Bible, but will conclude by reminding you that in the worship of the Church of England there is more of the Bible read than in the worship of any other religious body. You are not left simply to hear such parts as may be favourite portions of the minister who conducts the worship: but the selection runs through the Book, and there is no part with which an attendant at the worship of the Church does not become

more or less acquainted. It follows that if you are to live in the spirit of the worship of the Church, you must adopt the same method in your private devotions.

In an admirable address to the Lay Helpers Association of the Diocese in 1896, the Bishop sketched out a scheme of instruction for one who wanted guidance in reading the Scriptures, more especially the New Testament.

I should, of all things, encourage a *critical* study of the Bible; and by a critical study I mean the endeavour always to ascertain what was the precise meaning of the author when he wrote the words we read, and what is their bearing upon the life we are now living. For this purpose of critical study I will just sketch out what appears to me the course that should be followed by students who do not profess to be thoroughly acquainted with the original languages, either Greek or Hebrew, and therefore who must very largely, if not entirely, depend upon what they read in English. I think it would be best that any one who is intending to make such a systematic study of the Bible as I am going to speak about should begin with studying the New Testament and leave the Old Testament to wait, because it is obvious that it is far more important to know what the New Testament teaches than the Old, and the use of the Old Testament to us is mainly to throw light on the New. The New is the real guide to our lives, and we read the Old Testament in order that we may understand the New the better. In the New Testament it is on the whole best, I think, that we should begin with the study of the Gospels, although, side by side with their study, we may combine also the study of some of the easier Epistles, say the Epistles to the Thessalonians, perhaps also to the Philippians and to Philemon. I choose these three because they are the least argumentative, and are therefore more within the compass of those who for the first time engage in a thorough examination of the Apostolic writings. Well, suppose any one begins to study the Gospels, at the outset he had better take them in the order in which he finds them, although of course there is nothing to prevent his taking them in what order he finds suitable to himself except that the three earlier Gospels would naturally go together, and the Gospel of St. John would stand apart. The Gospel of

IV EDUCATIONAL WORK IN LONDON 95

St. John could not be very profitably studied side by side with the others. It would require a special study of its own, and for that reason it would perhaps be better to defer its study till something very real had been done with the three earlier Gospels. The difference between them is obvious on a very cursory reading. In the first place, in the Gospel of St. John you have chiefly our Lord's discourses at Jerusalem, where, as a rule, He was talking with highly educated Jews, with men quite, as a rule, of a different class from those whom he would address in Galilee or in some of the towns of Galilee. He would in Jerusalem naturally expect that those to whom He was speaking would understand Him when He was teaching them high and abstract doctrines, whereas down in the country He would not have to deal with men of the same calibre or cultivation, and there would therefore be a very considerable difference in the mode in which He would handle every subject He would have to speak about.

And, further than that, it has been the will of His providence that the Gospel of St. John, in recording the Jerusalem teachings, should be the work of a very distinguished Apostle, with special gifts which distinguished him in a marked way from all the other Apostles and writers in the New Testament. No doubt this plan was arranged because among the Apostles St. John was just the one who was fitted to speak about what we may call the supreme doctrines of the faith as no other Apostle was fitted, not even St. Paul. St. Paul no doubt was a more highly educated man than any other Apostle, but St. John, who was also himself a cultivated man—not sufficiently so to write good Greek, but yet educated enough in the knowledge of Hebrew theology and all the doctrines which the Rabbis were engaged in studying—had natural gifts which, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, marked him out as specially suitable to record the diviner side of our Lord's life and teachings to the Church.

The student begins, therefore, for that reason with the first three Gospels, and he leaves the Gospel of St. John to wait. The first three Gospels were written by ordinary plain men who could not be spoken of as men of very remarkable cultivation of mind, and who wrote very much as ordinary peasants and artisans would write, men who, in fact, are best compared amongst English writers to John Bunyan, the author of the *Pilgrim's Progress*. You would not speak of John Bunyan, when you read his *Pilgrim's Progress*—although it is the work

of a very high or the very highest genius—as a highly cultivated man or very widely read, and so, too, you would not speak of St. Matthew, or St. Mark, or St. Luke in any such language. St. Luke, although he was a more educated man than the other two, nevertheless was a very ordinary man, and his education is not shown in the substance of anything he writes, but merely in the fact that he writes very much better Greek than any other writer in the New Testament.

These are the men whose records you have to study in the beginning; and suppose, then, we begin with the Gospel of St. Matthew. The student should read it through, and before he has done with it he ought to read it through at least three times, taking great pains as he goes through it each time to endeavour, if possible, to find out the exact meaning of everything as he reads it. For this purpose a good commentary is of very great value, and the commentators are excellent guides for the purpose of which I am speaking now. The rule which the student will have to follow, and which, I am sorry to say, the commentaries do not sufficiently direct his attention to, is this: take care that you do not introduce into the Bible as you read it, and more particularly into the Gospels as you read them, the ordinary phases of ordinary modern life. As you read you unconsciously fill up the picture, and put, as it were, a sort of background to all the narratives; and you will be constantly putting as this background of the narratives your ordinary life, the life that you live amongst your fellows and they are living all around you, and in so doing you will be very often led into serious mistakes. You will take it for granted that things are not mentioned, not because they were familiar in those days, but because they did not exist in those days. It is an exceedingly common thing for men, when they are reading the Bible, to argue in something like this way: Why do the clergy put on a surplice when they are in church? The Apostles of old never did anything of the kind. But how do they know it? It is as certain as anything can be that our Lord did something of the kind, and it is equally certain that the Apostles did, because it was the universal practice in those days to wear a special dress for all purposes connected with religion; and if any had omitted to do this then it would have been mentioned, for the omission would have been a very striking thing, and one which the writer would have been sure to have noted. What

has not been mentioned is that which every one knew without it being mentioned: consequently the writer would not think it worth while to notice it or speak of it. All through the historical parts of the New Testament you have perpetually to remind yourself of this. The commentators, generally speaking, will supply you with information about the customs and practices of those days, but not always with the information which you yourself exactly need.

Then, in the next place, it is necessary that you should always be on your guard how you interpret what, after all, is not the original, but a translation of the original language. I have known such a case as a Baptist minister saying that infant baptism is clearly wrong, because in the Gospel of St. John we are told "except a *man* be born again," and that does not say a child. Well, any one who knows the Greek knows very well that the word so translated applies just as well to a woman or to a child. It includes both sexes and all ages, and the explanation founded upon the word *man* is a pure blunder. You have, I say, to be perpetually on your guard against this kind of mistake.

Then, further, having these cautions in your mind, endeavour as much as you can to supplement the narratives by such information as your commentary will give you. Seek always to find what is the connexion of thought which runs through every separate passage as you read it. And here I would mention, as particularly bearing upon this part of my subject, the wisdom of the student associating himself with two or three others in the study, because when you get three or four men together, and they are reading the Bible together, very often one man will see a connexion where the other men have not thought of it; and still more often it will be found that those who are thus working together will naturally look for the connexion; whereas, when a man is simply reading by himself, it generally does not occur to him to look for any such connexion at all.

Having gone through the Gospel of St. Matthew in this way, the next thing to be done is to go through it again with a view to seeing what is the purpose of the Gospel taken as a whole. Has St. Matthew a plan in writing the Gospel? What are the main divisions? And, not only what are the main divisions, but what is the purpose of each separate division? St. Matthew has a very marked plan—about that there can be no mistake at all, and his Gospel is written so entirely upon that plan that it may be said that he is not

very particular about the chronology. St. Luke, on the other hand, who is a very good historian, although not of a very high class, always instinctively looks to the chronology, and he is very anxious as far as he can to keep the things in the order in which they actually happened. He was not one of the ordinary attendants upon our Lord, and therefore, in some respects, at a disadvantage in this matter. But St. Matthew has a very clear plan, and the divisions are very easy to recognise, and, when recognised, the purpose is easy to follow.

This examination of the Gospel with a view to ascertaining what is the purpose of each separate part, is what I should call the second reading of the Gospel. It will not take quite so long as the first necessarily must. In the first reading you go through every verse and every word of every verse, and you ponder on every verse as you go on; but the second reading, where you look on the Gospel as a whole, will not occupy nearly so much time.

Then, in the third place, in order to complete your view of the Gospel you ought to study two matters. One of them you can only study imperfectly at first, because it implies something, particularly before it has been completed, namely, the comparison of the Gospel of St. Matthew with the other two of the three earlier Gospels. A great deal of light is thrown upon the Gospel of St. Matthew by this kind of study, and it is worth while to see how far there is behind the Gospel of St. Matthew a sort of common ground which is to be found in all these three earlier Gospels—a sort of common ground which has led the German critics (not, I think, very sensibly) to assume that there must have been once an original Gospel from which all the others were derived, and they speak of it as if they expected by a little more study actually to produce it and let us see what it was like. There is not the slightest evidence of any such original Gospel, and it is far more probable that the writers of the Gospels took what was common in them from one of themselves. I think that it is most probable that the common ground is to be found in St. Mark, but that is only probability; but I think that what was common to St. Mark and St. Matthew was taken by the latter after St. Mark had written his Gospel. You must remember that, although St. Matthew is always looked upon as the first writer of the Gospel, he began by writing, not a Greek Gospel, but a Hebrew, and there is some reason to suppose that St. Mark's

Gospel was a translation of St. Matthew's original Hebrew ; but afterwards St. Matthew wrote his Greek Gospel, and in that I think there is nothing surprising in our finding a good deal of what we find in the Gospel of St. Mark. The Gospel of St. Luke was written later still ; about that I think there can be no real doubt.

Reading it through for the third time, I said that there were two subjects that would require your attention, and these are—first, the comparison with the other two Gospels of that class ; and, secondly, the examination of St. Matthew's quotations from the Old Testament. The examination of all these quotations will give in some respect a new idea about the Gospel of St. Matthew, which we should not entertain if we had not these quotations before us. Well, by thus going through the Gospel of St. Matthew three times carefully a student will make himself well acquainted with that Gospel, even if he is not able to turn to the Greek for any enlightenment upon special points where the English language does not quite convey the meaning of the original. We have, of course, now a great assistance in the Revised Version. It does throw a good deal more light than we had before ; but, at the same time, I cannot help feeling that the Revised Version may sometimes rather mislead the students who are beginners because it is over-accurate, through the endeavour all along to represent in the English every word of the Greek, however simple that word may be. The result is that very often the English is overloaded with that which does not belong to the idiom of the English language. There are certain difficulties attending all translations, and this is one of them ; and I would not lay too much stress on the Revised Version, especially when it is dealing with little words. You find the article "the" used in the Revised Version when it is not always wanted, and when the Greek article is, in the passage thus translated, a very unimportant word indeed.

CHAPTER V

QUESTIONS OF RITUAL AND DOCTRINE

Ecclesiastical prosecutions—Confession—Commemoration of the dead—The Church Association—Unauthorised forms of service—The re-marriage of divorced persons—The Episcopal veto—St. Paul's reredos—Dr. Moberly's case—Relations with Nonconformists.

IN dealing with the question of the Bishop's attitude towards the ritual controversy in London, it should suffice to set forth certain broad considerations that had serious weight with him, though they were, and are, little appreciated by the general public.

In the first place, he felt that, inasmuch as neither the Prayer Book nor the law of the land gave the bishops power to coerce their clergy in the matter of ritual observance, there was no effectual remedy for disobedience to Episcopal authority short of prosecution, and that ultimate imprisonment for contempt of court, against which the better feeling of the country had already revolted. A letter to Mr. W. Martin Brown in reply to a complaint about the services at St. Cuthbert's, Philbeach Gardens, expresses this view :—

MY DEAR SIR—I regret as much as you do that there should be clergy who depart from the sober usages customary in the Church of England. But there is a considerable number of the laity who support them, and

the majority of the laity, as represented in Parliament, always steadily refuse to give the bishops effectual power to interfere. A Bishop can do nothing which any one may not equally do, viz., prosecute in the Ecclesiastical Courts. He may remonstrate, but remonstrances not backed by power soon come to nothing.—Yours faithfully,

F. LONDON :

FULHAM PALACE,
November 18, 1887.

As regards prosecution itself, he was strongly of opinion that it was not the business of a Bishop to resort to such a remedy. The subject came before the House of Lords in July 1900, when Lord Portsmouth, in the course of his introductory speech, commented as follows upon Episcopal action or inaction :—

It is all very well to talk about fatherly advice, but what is the use of fatherly advice without parental control? . . . What is the position of the bishops in this matter? The bishops are not rich men ; they are not in receipt of incomes which, considering the tremendous claims upon them, leave any margin. They cannot institute costly legal proceedings, and these clergymen know that under the existing state of the law the bishops have no coercive power ; they therefore carry on their practices with impunity. (Parl. Debates, Fourth Series, vol. 86, p. 18.)

In his reply the Archbishop indicated clearly the principle on which he had always acted :—

I, for my part, am quite ready in my own diocese to allow the prosecution of any clergyman who disregards the opinions which I have expressed in reference to the matters which have been argued before me,¹ and let it go to the furthest limit that it can go. But the noble Earl has himself pointed out that it is not the business of the bishops to prosecute. It is the business of the bishops to do all they can as Fathers in God to win their clergy over to the path marked out for them by the formularies of the Church.²

¹ The use of incense and the practice of reservation.

² See "Primacy" Memoir, p. 294 and pp. 354-355. —Ed.

In a previous speech before the House of Lords (February 9, 1899) he had laid stress upon another consideration, as often quite escaping public attention.

We (the bishops) cannot help looking to the main purpose for which the Church exists. We are thinking of men who are at work in the Church with the aim of bringing people to the foot of the Cross. We cannot exclude that consideration; it is impossible; and when you find that a man, who is perhaps very foolishly going into all sorts of ritual excesses, is at the same time a devoted servant of the Lord, and devoted to the work which is assigned him to do, you cannot help feeling that you must exercise great delicacy and care before you interfere with such work as his. Archbishop Tait, as you know, carried the Public Worship Regulation Act, and he it was who nevertheless stopped the prosecution of Father Lowder at the East India Docks. I was talking with him not long afterwards, and he said "I looked into the man's work, and I could not go on with any prosecution or allow it."

The failure of such public prosecutions as had taken place to effect the object in view was a further consideration that had weight with the Bishop's practical mind. He felt that there was a great distinction to be drawn between the complaint of the genuine aggrieved parishioner and that of an outsider—especially in the form of a self-constituted public body or association. He fully shared the desire of Archbishop Tait to prevent what that far-sighted prelate described as "reckless and wanton litigation carried on by societies with long purses, rather than by individuals personally dissatisfied." Hence Dr. Temple's repeated refusals to enter into correspondence with the Chairman of the Church Association on the numerous questions raised by that body with reference to the services in various London churches. The following extract from an able speech of the late Bishop Creighton in the House

of Lords (February 9, 1899) puts this aspect of the question very clearly :—

Why was prosecution abandoned by the bishops? . . . Prosecutions were abandoned because it was found that they absolutely failed. It is a matter of fact that after each period in which prosecution for ecclesiastical offences has been inaugurated, instead of there being a going back of ritualism, there has been a distinct advance of it. . . . It is assumed that when prosecution ceased the bishops were doing nothing. That was not the case. We strove our utmost to bring about a good understanding in all parishes where our intervention was called in, and the consequence was that in most of the country dioceses all disputed questions of ritual were settled by episcopal intervention on the grounds of the good sense and good feeling of those who lived within the parish. But the diocese of London presents peculiar conditions. In a great many cases there are churches which are not purely parochial, but rather congregational, and there is not the same feeling about a parish in London as, of course, there is in the country or in small towns. As a matter of fact, people go to such churches as they think fit, and complaints about the nature of the services carried on in any particular church rarely, indeed almost never, come before the bishop from one who claims to have any right to make them by virtue of living in that parish. In the diocese of London is it to be supposed that, because some one who lives in Penge writes to complain that passing along the Strand he accidentally stepped into a church and saw something he did not like, the bishop is at once to take action? It is impossible that he should do so. Complaints from those who feel that their rights are being injured, and that they have a grievance, very rarely come before the Bishop of London for determination. . . . The reason why the bishops did not intervene more strongly in former times was because they felt that their coercive compulsory intervention (by prosecution) would do more harm than the thing against which it was directed. What could be done by good sense they did. When cases were brought before them by those who had a right to complain, steps were at once taken, and the intervention was generally successful.

And there is ample evidence that, when occasion rightly demanded it, Bishop Temple was not back-

ward in doing his duty. He assured the House of Lords¹ that "when he was in the diocese of London he never passed over any case brought before him of the Invocation of Saints or the Worship of the Virgin." Shortly after he came to the diocese (October 1886), in the case of the Rev. C. Benson's licence, he refused to sanction the practice of hearing confessions in church. Mr. Benson's own account of the matter is as follows :—

TO THE EDITOR OF THE "GUARDIAN."

SIR—In the interests of the clergy and laity of the Church of England, no less than for the sake of affording an explanation to those who have trusted myself and my teaching, may I ask you to give publicity to the following facts and correspondence?

I have recently been working under a 'three months' permission from the Bishop of London at All Saints' Kensington, and was about to apply, at the expiration of that term, for an ordinary licence as assistant curate.

Some week or two ago a lady came into the Church and asked me to hear her confession; it may be well to state that, although for many years she had been accustomed to this practice, she had never been to me before for the purpose, nor had I in any way sought this then. I did hear it as a matter of course.

The Vicar was present, and very kindly raised no objection at the moment, but wrote later forbidding the repetition of such action on my part. I at once replied that I should be unable to apply for a licence in his parish. He wrote again, urging my continuance in the parish, and suggesting that with a general licence for the diocese I might practise this particular ministration in such churches as might be open to me for the purpose.

With small hope of success I wrote to the Bishop, asking for an interview to make such application for a general licence. This interview was granted, and in it he confirmed the Vicar's decision, with additions, and refused to grant, on such grounds, anything but an ordinary licence. The subjoined correspondence will explain the rest.

¹ February 9, 1899.

In conclusion, I would only add my entire satisfaction with the kindness and consideration shown to myself personally both by the Bishop and the Vicar. I am only now anxious to obtain formally from the Church of England the vindication, or the condemnation, of my view of this matter.

C. BENSON.

(Formerly Assistant Curate of St. James
the Less, Plymouth.)

112 KENSINGTON PARK ROAD,
October 11, 1886.

The actual letters to which the foregoing refers are as follows :—

25 COLVILLE SQUARE, W.
October 7.

MY LORD—I have the honour to inform you that, after mature consideration, I am unable to ask for an ordinary licence within your diocese, *upon the ground that my doing so would virtually amount to a denial on my part of the “laity’s right,” in the Church of England, to demand that their confessions be heard.*

I submit, under correction, this interpretation of my position with regard to such licence; for all that I am anxious to obtain, for the recognition of such rights to the laity, is your sanction of such recognition as at least a “tolerated opinion.”

Subject to your acceptance of such interpretation of my responsibility in asking for such licence—as you insist on my holding such licence, or none—I have only to request that you will formally sanction my retirement into lay communion.

May I venture to express, on the conclusion, apparently, of our more official relationship to each other, my deep personal sense of your Lordship’s justice and kindness to myself in the years of my ministry; and, in the interest of others, who, as myself in the past, may perhaps still be unconsciously advancing to the apparent ruin of their professional life, to submit further to your consideration the propriety of your moving for some synodical declaration of the mind of the Church of England upon this grave question touching her ministerial work. Indeed, if in your estimation I have no *moral* right to demand this, I appeal

to such a decision.—I remain, my Lord, faithfully and obediently yours,
C. BENSON.

The Right Rev. the Lord Bishop of London.

FULHAM PALACE, S.W.
October 7, 1886.

MY DEAR SIR—I have to acknowledge your letter, in which you state that you are unable to ask for an ordinary licence in this diocese. But I do not consider myself bound, nor do I think it necessary in the interests of the Church, to take note of the other part of your letter.

In saying this, however, I think it right to add that I do not mean to blame you for saying what you have said.—
Yours faithfully, F. LONDIN :

The Rev. C. Benson.

, 27 COLVILLE SQUARE, W.
October 8.

My Lord—I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your Lordship's letter, and, in the interests of those who may otherwise misunderstand my retirement, to request your permission to publish the facts and the ensuing correspondence with yourself.—I remain, my Lord, yours faithfully and obediently,
C. BENSON.

FULHAM PALACE, S.W.
October 9, 1886.

DEAR SIR—The Bishop of London desires me to acknowledge your letter of the 8th inst., and to say that his Lordship has no objection to your publishing the correspondence.—
Yours faithfully, W. D. FANSHAWE (Chaplain).

PS.—I will only add, by way of comment, that the question at issue does not appear to be "whether any particular minister does, or does not, approve of confession," but rather this—whether the Anglican clergy are to be indeed the ministers of the people, or clerical autocrats with power to give, or refuse, assistance according to the caprice of their individual wills.

It may be mentioned perhaps, in this connexion, that he strongly discountenanced young clergy being by their incumbents permitted to hear confessions at all. The only person whom he was

willing to recognise, as a rule, in the capacity of father confessor, was the incumbent of the parish himself.

He found things (writes one of his suffragans) altogether out of hand in certain London churches, and he did all in his power, short of that public prosecution which he felt was a greater evil than the one it sought to remedy, to bring them into line.

The present Archbishop of Canterbury (Dr. Davidson) put the principle that guided Dr. Temple's action as Bishop of London into a nutshell when, in his admirable speech on "Clergy Discipline" to a deputation of 114 Unionist Members of Parliament at Lambeth Palace on March 11, 1903, he described it thus:—

The robust common-sense of Englishmen will deal with these matters as they ought to be dealt with. We should make a mistake to bring them into Courts of Law. Go ahead and do your work, and the thing will right itself. This expectation has not come true (added the Archbishop); he (Dr. Temple) found that it did not come true; but it was not he and the bishops alone, but the general public opinion, which was making the mistake—if mistake it was—which after a certain number of years has resulted in what we have seen. I say "if mistake it was," because we have yet to know what might have been the result another way if prosecution had been pushed forward in the teeth of evangelical opinion by bishops or any other individuals at the time.

Another consideration should be noticed which prevented Bishop Temple from taking the line about Eucharistic doctrine which was pressed upon him by the Evangelical school. Although he declared publicly in the House of Lords that he considered the use of the term "Mass" by the clergy as most mischievous because of its Romish associations,¹ he nevertheless reminded the Peers on another occasion² that in the case of Mr.

¹ February 9, 1899.

² July 16, 1900.

Bennett, of Frome, the Privy Council had “decided in favour of refusing to condemn language of a strong nature which spoke of believing, and teaching others to believe, that the Lord was Himself present in the consecrated elements of the Holy Communion,” and had thus “gone to the utmost length of giving liberty to the teaching of doctrine which they themselves acknowledged was not the teaching that was naturally to be drawn from the formularies of the Church (of England), but which they could not condemn because the Church had nowhere forbidden the holding or teaching of it.”

At all times obstacles to conciliatory action were forced upon the Bishop, and difficulties accentuated, by the violent and unreasonable character of the “protests” of partisans on either side.

A single instance in point should suffice. On November 10, 1893, the Vicar of Old St. Pancras, the Rev. R. A. Eden, wrote to the Bishop the following letter on the question of commemorating the Christian dead :—

In these days of revived memorial services I have felt a strong desire on one day in each year to commemorate the faithful dead who are lying here, and in other St. Pancras cemeteries in which our more recent interments have taken place, by a special celebration of the Holy Eucharist, at which I would propose to use the Collect, Epistle, and Gospel which your Lordship has already, with great kindness, permitted me to employ at funeral celebrations of the Holy Communion. I think this annual commemoration would be a service which would soon be highly appreciated and become a great comfort to some of our people.

Moreover, there are circumstances in our case which give a special value to anything which would help to keep our parishioners reminded of what their churchyard really is, for (together with the adjoining cemetery of St. Giles-in-the-Fields) it was some years ago converted into a public garden,

and whatever of good there may be in such an arrangement it seems to have this drawback at any rate, that the more the ground (as time goes on) loses the aspect of a cemetery, and proclaims itself a well-kept garden, the more does its real character appear to be forgotten, and there can be little doubt that such an annual commemoration as I aim at will have a tendency to check this forgetfulness. . . . I should be very grateful if your Lordship would kindly sanction the proposed celebration.

The Bishop's Chaplain replied on November 15 :
 "The Bishop bids me say you have his permission,"
 and the Commemoration took place on the Third Sunday in Advent at 11.15 A.M.

The result was a long letter of complaint from Captain Cobham, Chairman of the Church Association, in which he said :—

I need not point out to your Lordship that it is ridiculous to commemorate persons whose very names are unknown to the commemorators, or who are *mere* names to them, like that fourteenth century priest who was "specially" commended by the Vicar. The unreality here is too obvious to need mention. . . . In the hymn used at the Offertory it was stated that "the brethren before the throne," who were also described as being "in Paradise at rest,"

Yet in Sacrament and prayer
 Each with other have a share,

a statement which your Lordship knows as well as I do is a mere superstitious falsehood invented by priests to make money, as is also the further statement that

Saints departed even thus
 Hold communion with us.

The dead cannot have anything whatever to do with Sacraments. Your Lordship knows that the occupants of St. Pancras Churchyard have NO share, and you have far too much common-sense to believe in such drivelling nonsense daringly addressed in acts of worship to the Almighty. . . . I am the more amazed at the conduct of your Lordship, because, so recently as February 19, 1892, in your place in Convocation, you had singled out Prayers

for the Dead as the sort of service which, even in the laxest view of the Act of Uniformity, no bishop could possibly sanction. I still cling to the hope that your Lordship may have been misrepresented—in which case you will see the urgency of publicly disclaiming the false teaching and illegal practices which at present seem to flourish under your Lordship's direct patronage.

To this communication no immediate reply was given, and in a second letter Captain Cobham said :—

The exclusive responsibility which, under the veto, is now lodged in the Diocesan, gives to his silence or inaction under such circumstances a disastrous importance, and, if persisted in, would involve a deliberate abandonment of the duties belonging to his high office. I confidently feel that such silence and such inaction would not be incurred by any conscientious minister of the Church of England; and I appeal, therefore, to your Lordship to fulfil the responsibilities which you so successfully vindicated yourself.

On the following day the following reply was sent :—

The Bishop of London is much obliged by being informed of the view which Captain Cobham takes of the duty of a Bishop.

What else could be said? The writer of the protest had seen fit, either wilfully or through ignorance, to caricature the whole question at issue; and the Bishop (whose views as to Prayers for the Dead were afterwards set forth in his Canterbury Visitation Charge of 1898) had neither the time nor the inclination to controvert the opinions of so confident a critic.

That the Bishop was utterly opposed to unauthorised forms of service is clear from the following extract from his Visitation Charge for 1895 :—

I feel bound to add that nothing is less likely to bring us nearer to the desired end of unity than to increase the divisions amongst ourselves by the adoption of forms of

service alien to the character and spirit of the Book of Common Prayer. I have every desire to speak gently of the men who are so often discontented with our present forms of worship, and want ever fresh improvements, as they think them, services sometimes brought back from before the Reformation, sometimes of later date, but imported from abroad. I know many who are moved to this, whose character and devotion to the religious life guarantee that their aims and impulses are of the highest order; and yet I am quite sure that what they are doing is not only hurting the Order of the Church, but shaking her inner unity, and in this way greatly diminishing her energy. . . . If our services are to be improved, depend upon it all true improvement must follow the lines, and be full of the spirit of the Prayer Book. The promise which every incumbent makes at his institution to his parish, and every curate when he is licensed to his curacy, to use no other form than that prescribed in the Book of Common Prayer, unless ordered to do so by lawful authority, is a very clear promise, and the very condition on which he holds his place. It is distinctly dishonourable to break such a promise as this. And, if it be asked, what is the lawful authority? the answer is quite certain. This authority has been in the Bishop from the earliest ages, and the State so entirely recognises the Bishop's position that it arms the Bishop with power to forbid the prosecution of any clergyman whom the Bishop considers it would be wrong to prosecute. If for any reason a clergyman desires permission to use any service not in the Prayer Book, let him apply to the Bishop. If the Bishop gives his sanction all responsibility is transferred from the clergyman to the Bishop, and if any one is to be prosecuted it must be the Bishop himself before the Archbishop in his Court.

The Bishop's views on the re-marriage of divorced persons are set forth in his answers to the following questions which were put to him by one of his clergy :—

Q. A lady has been divorced (she was the "innocent" party, but I am aware that this can make no difference as to the question of her re-marriage). Am I *bound to say* that the Church will not recognise her re-marriage? *Ans.* Certainly not. Q. Have I a right to say (as I am disposed to say) that if she claims her civil liberty to re-marry, and

contracts a civil marriage, acting therein according to her conscience, I should have no wish to exclude her from Communion if she conscientiously seeks Communion? *Ans.* Yes. *Q.* Knowing the law (*viz.* that I can refuse to marry her,¹ but that I cannot refuse the use of the church if she can find a priest willing to marry her), am I justified in dissuading her from seeking to be married in church, recommending a civil marriage in preference? *Ans.* No. *Q.* She particularly wishes to have "the Church's blessing" on her re-marriage, which according to the Church's doctrine ought not to be? *Ans.* The Church always strongly dissuaded the innocent party from re-marrying, but never forbade it.

The Bishop fully recognised the difficulty of using the Marriage Service in the Book of Common Prayer, with its solemn and unqualified promises, in the case of a divorced person whether innocent or not.

Once more, it has been said that the Bishop repeatedly vetoed prosecutions for ritualism. As a matter of fact he only exercised the episcopal veto once—in the case of the attack made upon the new reredos at St. Paul's, an account of which follows. The present Archbishop of Canterbury, then Bishop of Winchester, conclusively cleared the whole bench of bishops of the charge brought against them by Sir William Harcourt, by proving to the House of Lords, in February 1899, that with three trifling but significant exceptions (one of them being the St. Paul's Reredos case),² no living bishop had in any instance ever exercised the veto at all.

In April 1888, the Bishop of London was

¹ The writer is mistaken as to the provision of the law on this point. It is only in the case of the *guilty* party in a divorce suit for adultery that the parish priest has the option of refusing to re-marry.

² The other two cases occurred (1) in 1876, when the Bishop of Gloucester (Ellicott) vetoed a prosecution on the ground that the facts which were in dispute were at that moment *sub judice* in a Court of Law; and (2) in 1886, when the Bishop of Exeter (Bickersteth) exercised his right of veto in a case which was of a somewhat insignificant character.

approached by the Church Association with a Memorial, signed by 9000 Churchmen in the diocese, asking that action should be taken against the authorities of St. Paul's. This petition he refused to grant. It was therefore decided to apply to the Court of Queen's Bench for a mandamus to compel him to allow a case to go forward, on the ground that the reasons which he had given were insufficient and unreasonable. The Bishop's reply to the Church Association Memorial was as follows :—

I have always looked on the Reformation as the greatest blessing bestowed by God on the Church of England since first the Gospel was preached in this country. I hold firmly to the principles of that Reformation, and it is for that reason that I consider the memorialists entirely mistaken in the course which they adopt, and in which they desire me to concur.

I can well understand a desire to banish all sculptured representations of our Lord from the conspicuous position which the Crucifixion occupies in the lately erected reredos, and some years ago, when the Dean and Chapter of Exeter Cathedral erected a reredos, in which the figure of our Lord occupied this very position, I gave every facility for having the question of its legality brought to trial.

The chief defender of the reredos at Exeter was the late Dean Boyd, whom certainly no one who knew him would accuse of being indifferent to the principles of the Reformation. His defence was ultimately successful, and the reredos was pronounced a lawful erection.

When once this has been ruled, I fail to understand how it can be considered compatible with the principles of the Reformation to draw nice distinctions between the figure of our Lord crucified and the figure of our Lord ascending, and to say that one tends to idolatry, and the other not. Such subtleties savour of the Rabbinical distinctions, once emphatically condemned by our Lord, between the temple and the gold of the temple, between the altar and the gift upon the altar, and are utterly alien to the spirit of the Reformation.

The principles of the Reformation are marked by breadth

and simplicity, and they appeal to the common sense of ordinary religious men. It certainly would not tend to advance those principles, but rather to discredit them, if, in their name, the Dean and Chapter of St. Paul's were required to remove the figure of our Lord upon the Cross, and were allowed to substitute the figure of our Lord in the act of His ascension.

I feel confident that on further reflection many of the memorialists will agree with me that the question was really decided in the Exeter case.

But I must add to this the expression of my firm conviction that, necessary as it was, at a time when many had but just escaped from the errors of Rome and many were still entangled in those errors, to remove what was bound up with recent superstition, there is not now the slightest danger that any Christian in this country would be tempted to idolatry by any work of art, however lifelike or however beautiful.

In answer to this letter Captain Cobham wrote on behalf of the Association that there was nothing in the reply which even professed to deal with the grounds of the Memorial. He then traversed the following affirmations :—

(1) That the case of *Philpotts versus Boyd* ruled absolutely the lawfulness of "all sculptured representations of our Lord."

(2) That our Lord Himself, in Matthew xxiii. 17-19, emphatically condemned, "as a subtle and nice distinction," any attempt to discriminate between the relative greatness of the temple and its gold, of the altar and its gift.

(3) That no Christian in this country "is now in the slightest danger of the errors and superstitions" which your Lordship says were those of Rome, and which, as you admit, at one time entangled many.

The Chairman of the Church Association then continued :—

I fear to trespass further upon your Lordship's time, but I cannot take leave of this subject without saying that many persons will regard it as an unjust and invidious exercise of power that a Bishop, who is a minister of the law, should

deny to 9000 of his fellow-Churchmen the right of testing the legality of a scandalous and wanton innovation. Your Lordship may, from your individual standpoint, deem it inexpedient to allow the rights of the aggrieved to be defended before an independent and impartial tribunal, but peace cannot be purchased by the denial of justice, nor can party spirit be stilled by allowing one party to outrage the feelings of all others, and to set at defiance (with impunity) the law of the land. The manifest injustice and partisanship of such a course will, I trust, prove a death-blow to the iniquitous veto itself.

To this the Bishop answered immediately :—

I regret that the reasons which I have given you for my action do not appear satisfactory to your mind, but I think that, on the whole, the great majority of Churchmen will take very nearly my view of the matter.

In the legal document in which the Bishop declined to permit proceedings in respect to the reredos, the following sentence occurs :—

Litigation in these matters is sometimes necessary in order to settle disputed points of grave importance; but even in such cases litigation is a necessary evil. It keeps up irritation and party strife, it embitters men's feelings, it inflicts much mischief on the Church and on true religion, and it is only tolerable as a preventive of worse mischief that would otherwise follow. It is always possible, after any great question of principle has been decided (as in the Exeter case), to keep up litigation indefinitely by raising minor points, and such litigation becomes more mischievous the longer it is continued, while the results obtained from it are of exceedingly little value.

The next step consisted in an application for a mandamus to the Queen's Bench Division in July 1888. The Court was asked, in effect, to compel the Bishop either to transmit the representation to the Archbishop, or to himself consider it with reference to the circumstances of the case. The result of the application was that a *rule nisi* for

a mandamus was granted by Lord Coleridge and Mr. Justice Manisty, Baron Pollock dissenting, which was afterwards made absolute.

But on an appeal, by the unanimous and emphatic judgment of the Court, consisting of the Master of the Rolls (Lord Esher) and Lords Justices Lindley and Lopes, the decision of Lord Coleridge and Mr. Justice Manisty was reversed. The Act says that the Bishop, before deciding to stop proceedings, is "to consider the whole circumstances of the case," and these words were now held by the Court of Appeal to be "enabling" and not "limiting" words; so that the Bishop might properly consider, as he did in the present case, "whether the proceedings could end in any result which would make up to the Church, and to the religious life of the country, for the mischief which must inevitably be inflicted on them by the litigation itself."

As to the question of law raised by the Bishop of London, viz. whether the principles laid down in the Exeter case did not cover the issues raised in this case,¹ Lord Coleridge and Mr. Justice Manisty thought that the Bishop's reasoning was so defective as to be irrelevant and nugatory. But Lord Justice Lopes said distinctly, the other members of the Court concurring, that the Bishop had correctly stated and rightly applied the legal principles in question. The House of Lords upheld the decision of the Court of Appeal. It became, therefore, settled law (1) that, in judging of the legality of images or sculptured work, the tests would in future be the very ones applied by the Bishop to the St. Paul's case: (2) that a Bishop's discretion under the Public Worship Regulation Act was general, not particular: that the inquiry he was directed to make might "justly

¹ See "Exeter" Memoir, vol. i. pp. 528-534.—Ed.

include consideration for the good to be done, or the mischief involved," in the proceedings he was asked to sanction; that he was not merely to consider whether the complaint was frivolous, or whether there had been really some infraction of the law; that his opinion could not be reviewed; that it was not for the House of Lords to determine what were the considerations which ought to govern it; that, on the contrary, it rested with him to decide what constituted the circumstances of the case as well as what conclusion he was to form upon the consideration of them. Nothing could be stronger or more definite than these statements of the Lord Chancellor (Halsbury), Lord Bramwell and Lord Herschell; they placed the Episcopal Veto on a firmer basis than its warmest advocates had up to that time ventured to assign to it.¹

Among the cases of quite another kind that the Bishop was called upon to deal with was that of Dr. Momerie, who held, for some years, the Chair of Logic and Metaphysics at King's College. A distinguished scholar and writer, Senior in the Cambridge Moral Science Tripos and Fellow of St. John's College, Dr. Momerie unfortunately forsook the philosophical and metaphysical line of studies in which he excelled, to take up the rôle of theological critic. In attacking the doctrines of the Church to which he belonged, he made the serious mistake of imputing to the Church itself crude definitions of doctrines that had emanated from narrow schools of thought within its pale, and of dealing with sacred subjects in public lectures with a flippancy that tended to degrade them in popular estimation. In these lectures it was evident that his knowledge of Biblical criticism and his appreciation of ecclesiastical history were by

¹ The three trials cost the Bishop £2340 : 5 : 1; in addition which the Dean and Chapter of St. Paul's paid £417 : 8 : 4

no means equal to his admittedly high scientific attainments. The practical difficulty at King's College was that the theological students were obliged to attend Dr. Momerie's lectures, and the Council therefore felt bound to take official cognisance of his published opinions. It was a case that had some superficial resemblance to that of Frederick Denison Maurice; but there was this essential difference, that no one ever doubted the force, earnestness, and intrinsic worth of Maurice's teaching, nor the intense reverence with which he invariably treated theological questions. Moreover, Maurice was deprived of his professorship, whereas Momerie was not. After two interviews with the Bishop and two meetings of the Council, a compromise was agreed to, by which the Chair of Logic and Metaphysics was transferred from the department of Theology (to which it had up to then belonged) to that of General Literature and Science. The Dean of Llandaff (Dr. Vaughan) and Mr. Gladstone objected to the arrangement, and would have preferred a censure of certain of Dr. Momerie's writings that had been brought under the notice of the Council, unaccompanied by any practical action. The result of the compromise was that the theological students of King's College were no longer compelled to attend the lectures of the Professor of Logic and Metaphysics. Dr. Momerie ever afterwards appreciated the great personal kindness of the Bishop and of his successor, Dr. Creighton, both of whom, while deploring the attitude he adopted, cordially recognised his intellectual ability and undoubted genius.

The Bishop's relations with Christian bodies outside the Anglican Communion were always of a friendly character: but one exceptional case must be mentioned here as having had important results.

In the autumn of 1886 Dr. Parker, of the City Temple, announced that the Rev. H. R. Haweis, perpetual Curate of St. James', Westmoreland Street, would on October 28 preach at his chapel; but the Bishop of London wrote to Mr. Haweis as follows:—

MY DEAR SIR—Dr. Parker has written to tell me that you have arranged to preach at the City Temple on Thursday morning at noon. I think it right to say that it is without my sanction and against my wishes. I am confident that action of that kind has more tendency at the present moment to embitter than to soothe the differences between different Christian bodies. I have replied to Dr. Parker to that effect.

Though Mr. Haweis had not, strictly speaking, been inhibited from preaching at the City Temple, he did not fulfil his engagement after this expression of opinion. Dr. Parker and Mr. Guinness Rogers violently opposed the Bishop's action as uncatholic and unchristian, but Mr. Edward White, who was then Chairman of the Congregational Union of England and Wales, in a letter to *The Times*, expressed his opinion that the Bishop was perfectly right, on the ground that the Act of Uniformity obliged all Bishops to maintain the exclusive attitude of the Church.

It is not (he wrote) a question of individual breadth or narrowness of view. Bishop Temple is not likely to err in such a case through pride or prejudice, or through anything less than principle. Let the questions of conformity and subscription be fought out on their merits, and let us not attempt to carry our contention by setting at naught solemn engagements. Just legislation cannot be promoted by private dishonour, or by conniving at illegality. Let the existing law be steadily enforced, and then before long the nation as a whole, shocked at the frightful disunion of Protestants, will insist on the amendment or repeal of the Act of Uniformity in the face of day, and all parties will be able to respect one another in the interval.

Dr. Parker replied that Mr. White had no power to speak for the Congregational Union as such :—

While admitting that bishops, like others, are bound to obey the law, their obedience might, in such a case as this, be accompanied by an expression of regret that such a law prevails. If the Bishop had said, "I must obey the law though I do so with regret, seeing that Conformists and Nonconformists are really united in many vital points of Christian doctrine," not a dissentient voice would probably have been heard. What the Bishop did say was, "If you preach it will be without my sanction and against my wishes."

Mr. H. C. Richards pointed out at the same time to Churchmen and dissenters that

The disestablishment of the Church of England would in no way open the pulpits or permit the laxity of ecclesiastical discipline which Mr. Haweis and Dr. Parker sought. The Episcopal Churches in communion with the Church of England in America and in the Colonies were as strict in this rule as our Church with its Act of Uniformity must be. In the Church of Ireland, where Church feeling was not as strong as in England, such an exchange was not permitted nor desired. It was therefore absurd for Dr. Parker to attempt to use this obstacle as a lever for disestablishment.

The really important outcome of the correspondence was the adoption by the Lower House of Convocation, in May 1887, of the following *articulus cleri* :—

That whereas certain priests of the Church of England have preached by invitation of those who are not in communion with the Church in places in which its doctrine and its discipline are avowedly opposed, we, the clergy, while duly acknowledging the charitable motives and intentions of those who accept the invitations referred to, desire to express our belief that the acceptance of such invitations is not only contrary to the principles and laws of the Church, but tends to hinder rather than promote the unity of Christian people.

This House respectfully requests their Lordships, the Bishops, to take such steps as may be in their power to prohibit and suppress this innovation, which is a great scandal in the eyes of many devoted Church people, and is detrimental to the spread of true religion.

This resolution produced in the Upper House a remarkably clear exposition of the whole question by Dr. Harold Browne, Bishop of Winchester, who said in the course of his speech :—

The Reformation, I hold, did not mean what many people think ; it did not mean the right of private judgment ; it did not mean the Bible only as the religion of Protestants, though all this may have followed on it. As I understand it, it meant this :—The Church had been suffering for a long time from intolerable oppression and tyranny, and that oppression and tyranny was not only galling in itself, but it imperilled the truth of religion and the faith of our people. . . . The Church, consequently, rid herself of this oppression and tyranny and reformed herself on the principles of the Primitive Church, but she maintained those principles with unabated zeal, and in their fullest integrity. . . . It was a great national movement of a great national Church. Now I have the greatest respect for Dissenters, or Nonconformists as they prefer to call themselves now, but the very principle of dissent is a denial of the principles of the English Reformation. I have laid down, I think, the principle of the Reformation. It was a great nation and a great Church reforming itself when it was impossible to get the whole of Christendom to reform itself. But the Dissenters have a totally different principle, viz. that for very slight differences of opinion you may separate from a great National Church, and that any body of men that like may set up a new Church of their own. That, I say, is in direct antagonism to the principles of the English Reformation. It is not the case, as has been stated in newspapers and the like, that this is a question of Apostolical Succession, or a question of Episcopacy. These are things which I am quite willing to enter into in their proper place. But, if there were no such questions as Apostolical Succession, or the Apostolicity of Episcopacy, still all I have said would be true, viz. that the entire National Church reformed itself, and that the breaking up into any number of sects is

antagonistic to the great principle of the English Reformation. Thus it seems to me, however well intentioned the clergy may be who wish to join in public worship in the chapels of our Nonconformist brethren, the doing so is untrue to the principles of the Reformation in this country ; the ignoring of all this, and the treating of every modern sect as on the same footing as the great ancient Church reformed at the Reformation, is simple confusion. . . . I have the strongest possible feeling of desire for closer union with all Christians. I desire to the utmost to see that. It is the longing of my heart, and I believe the longing of all our hearts. But then the question is entirely whether this breaking down of all the old landmarks, and doing away with all distinctions and ignoring all old principles, is the likely way to effect such union. It might produce a temporary truce, but never a permanent peace.

The Bishop then submitted the following resolution, which was carried unanimously :—

That in the opinion of this House it is contrary to the principles of the Catholic Church, as maintained at the English Reformation, that clergymen should take part in the public religious services of those who are not in full communion with the Church of England, and that it is desirable that the bishops should use their authority and influence to induce the clergy of their respective dioceses to abstain from such practices. Nevertheless this House deeply sympathises with the desire to bring all Christians into closer communion with each other through union with the great Head of the Church, and recognises the fact that there are many ways of maintaining kindly intercourse with Nonconformists which are not open to reasonable objection.

CHAPTER VI

SOCIAL PROBLEMS

The Anti-Sweating League—The unemployed—Poor relief—
Social purity—Church and Stage Guild—The relation of
the clergy to party politics—The temperance question—
The Dockers' Strike, 1889—Bishop's Park, Fulham.

THE Bishop's interest in social questions was keen and constant. Not only did he feel, as every Christian must, that the temporal and spiritual—the secular and religious—sides of the welfare of the people reacted and were mutually dependent upon each other, but he often gave expression to his appreciation of the religious value of social life in itself, as, for example, in an address given at the opening, on October 31, 1896, of the Pepys Mission-House and Clubs, which had been erected in Rochester Row as the centre for the social work of the Church in the parish of St. Stephen's, Westminster. On this occasion he pointed out

that there was a blessing in the intercourse of God's creatures one with the other, in their enjoying one another's society and in making friends. It was a blessing which had a peculiar effect upon their lives, for the Heavenly Father always wished that the services rendered to Him should be cheerful. It was not desired that Christian work should be done in any spirit of gloom, or as if it were a hard task, but in the spirit of children in the presence of the Father who loved them, and whom they loved. All the social enjoyment which God had provided

for us was not only perpetually blessed by Him, but it had its effect upon our spiritual life and all we did for His service. They would, however, meet in that hall at times for something more than merely social enjoyment; it was intended to be the centre of many good works, and it would confer greater blessings than many of the recipients would be aware of; for some of the best blessings came in very commonplace ordinary disguise, and yet for all that they were God's blessings. Parochial work in English parishes now—and particularly in that diocese—meant far more than the visiting of the sick, the instruction of the young, the conduct of the services of the Church, and the preaching of God's Word. Every minister of the Gospel was surrounded by all kinds of works subordinated to those, the one great aim of which was ever the same—to encourage men to love and serve one another, to teach practical lessons of unselfishness, to teach men to care first of all for their own families, who were to them the gift of God, but also in a right degree for all other families outside. The Divine Presence would be with them in their various labours, in the Mission-House and Clubs, as it was at their own firesides, at meals, and when making jokes and enjoying fun; since all these things could be, and ought to be, sanctified to the highest ends.

Scant justice has been done by common report to the Bishop's social qualities and social instincts, which were as brilliant of their kind as they were strong. In no sense was he a recluse.

While he cared little about public dinners and the artificial gatherings of polite society, he loved homely social intercourse. Those who knew him intimately will remember how he enjoyed his afternoon teas at Fulham in the drawing-room, when he was wont to unbend to his friends and to be merry as a schoolboy—ready to talk and exchange repartees on any subject.

On one such occasion it was that he overheard a chaplain asking Mrs. Temple whether there was any truth in the story of his having said to an ordination candidate, "I suppose you are engaged to be married?" in answer to the candidate's

assertion that "a lady had told him he could read well and audibly in church." "Let me hear the story," said the Bishop; and the chaplain was obliged to repeat it, adding that the Bishop was said to have remarked, when the candidate confessed that he *was* engaged and that the lady in question *was* his *fiancée*, "Well, you take my advice, and listen to what she says *after* you are married, but not before." "Ah!" exclaimed Dr. Temple, "that's what I ought to have said, but unfortunately I didn't think of it in time."

On another occasion a grave dignitary was defending the Headmaster of a Public School against a charge of excessive severity in flogging which had at one time been brought against him. "He flogged but very seldom," said the speaker innocently, "and then though the strokes were numerous, they were light." "Oh! *you* knew all about it, did you?" retorted the Bishop.

His delight was to give and take a keen thrust, as when in reply to a remark of Sir Frank Lascelles, then Persian Minister, that he had been able to send assistance to the Nestorian Christians in Assyria, he promptly exclaimed, "Are you aware that if we had lived three hundred years ago it would have been my duty to send you to the stake?"

He was as fond of weak tea, and plenty of it, as was the late Master of the Rolls, Sir A. L. Smith; and many are the tea stories, mostly apocryphal, that are told of him. He did dislike, however, to have strong tea pressed upon him; and when a lady insisted on giving him the noxious beverage, arguing that too much water spoiled the tea and drowned its flavour, he cut short the discussion by asking, "Do you know best, or do I; what I like most?"

But, to pass on from the Bishop's sociable

temperament to his dealings with the social problems of the day, there can be no doubt that he was a wise and cautious reformer. When he was convinced, as in the case of temperance, of the wisdom of a movement, he threw himself into it heart and soul : but he never acted without having carefully considered the case in all its bearings. When, for example, he was asked to join the Anti-Sweating League, in October 1889, he wrote to Mr. T. Sutherst, a leading promoter and member, as follows :—

I should prefer to wait for the report of the Committee of the House of Lords on Sweating before joining the League, and I could not approve of such expressions as I see in your "Objects," namely, "*by which the worker is oppressed and deprived of the legitimate fruits of his labour.*" I do not know what are the "legitimate fruits" of any man's labour, and such language seems to me to be misleading and mischievous. The choice is constantly this : Shall a man get wages on which he cannot live, or no wages at all ? I think he ought, in that alternative, to get no wages at all ; for then he will be driven to transfer his labour to some place where he can get wages on which he can live. The principle for which I would contend is, that if a man employs another man he must give him wages on which he can live ; but there are businesses I fear which would cease to exist if this principle were universally adopted, and the workers in them would get nothing. I think it imperative always to bear this in mind.

Again, speaking at a meeting for men in Birmingham Town Hall, January 1895, the Bishop referred at length to the question of the unemployed. He said that it was

a remarkable phenomenon that, though a very large number of Londoners lived all the year round in London, all those who had the chance lived partly in London and partly in the rural districts. The upper class always did so, and the same thing was true of the opposite end of the scale—the tramps usually spending the pleasantest part of the year

in the country "looking for work," as they said. His knowledge of them—and it was pretty extensive—was that they were quite willing to work, but on this condition—that for every two days' work there should be at least two days' holiday, and that they should not stay more than four days in any one place. In the winter they flocked into London, and called themselves "the unemployed." And whilst there was that trouble there were, besides, a very considerable number who were willing to work, and work hard and steadily, but who could not get work to do. They had nothing like it in Birmingham, but he mentioned the case of London because the probability was that if they let go their moral hold on those people the trouble which prevailed in London would grow till it fell upon other places, and Birmingham would have its share of it.

On the question of poor relief he spoke with no uncertain sound :—

They knew by sad experience that to lift people up without their own co-operation was simply impossible, and that anything in the nature of relief which acted upon their circumstances without acting upon their character was really thrown away, so far as any good could be expected of it, and was not merely wasted but mischievous. It was a perpetual lesson to them that, when our Lord charged Christians with a duty of this kind, He showed that it would require all the powers of their understandings, of Christian diligence and observation, as well as of kindly sympathy of heart, without which no Christian duty could be discharged at all. They saw plainly that the quieter such work was done the better was the result. If they began to make proclamation of what they were doing, and told the world they were going to lay hold of this class and transform it by some magic of their own, the most certain result would be more mischief a great deal than good. They might be able in that way to save a few, but those few at the cost of degrading and lowering a very large number ; and, if they wanted to do such a work as this—not only for the sake of their own individual character and services, but in order that it might be truly the work of God, in order that the work itself might succeed—it was hardly possible to push too far the precept, "Let not your left hand know what your right hand doeth." .

The reference of this declaration was obviously

to "General" Booth's Scheme, about which he did not entertain sanguine expectations.

Passing on from the question of poor relief, we come to the still graver problem of social purity. One of the earliest pastoral letters written by the Bishop to his clergy was suggested by the so-called revelations of the *Pall Mall Gazette* in the summer of 1885.

REV. AND DEAR BROTHER—The passing of the Criminal Law Amendment Act, and still more the circumstances which have attended the passing of that Act, appear to me to lay a fresh and serious responsibility on us, the clergy. The exposure lately made of the extent and organisation of vice in the Metropolis has caused the greatest pain and distress to many excellent people, and not a few believe this exposure has done more harm than any use to be made of it can do good. I have not shared and do not share that opinion. The hot indignation that has been roused all over England is certain, in my judgment, to overpower the moral mischief that so many fear, and I feel confident the result will be a general raising of the moral tone on this subject throughout the country. . . . Young men have strong passions, but they have generous instincts which can always be appealed to successfully. . . . I think that in the first place we are bound to dwell much in our teaching on the duty we owe to the young in this matter. There is no measuring the mischief which men of mature age can do and have done by speaking lightly of impure conduct, or by encouraging the false and unchristian notion that purity is impossible in the male sex and therefore not required. Still more important is the duty which parents owe to their children. It is possible for parents to inculcate purity as none else can, and it is a duty which is often grievously neglected.

It may not be wise to touch very often on such subjects before a mixed congregation; but still earnest teaching is needed even there sometimes, and very often at seasons of special solemnity, such as Advent or Lent, services for men only will give opportunities for being more plain-spoken than would be right before women and children.

In the second place, you may be able to form societies of men with a special view to the encouragement of purity of

life and conduct, or to engraft such an aim on your existing parochial societies. Young men are not unwilling to unite in such movements, and to avail themselves of the helps thus offered them in fighting against this strong temptation. Such societies can do much to banish impure conversation and impure literature, and to help all the right-minded to put a ban on unchaste livers.

Thirdly, in the preparation of candidates for confirmation and in your general teaching you can insist with the utmost earnestness on the duty of not dallying with temptation. This, which is a duty in the conflict with all sins, is pre-eminently a duty in the conflict with impurity.

Fourthly, you can do your part in what, taken as a whole, belongs more properly to the laity—the formation of vigilance committees and similar machinery for watching over and aiding in the administration of the law. Much more can probably be done by steadily enforcing the law than has been done yet.

But, above all, I entreat you to labour diligently to raise the tone of public opinion and to maintain a high standard thereafter. It is in the principles that men hold, rather than in any rules or laws that they lay down or the machinery they form, that our hope rests of purifying society in any real or permanent measure. Our teaching should be graver, more earnest, more solemn on this subject than it has ever been before. To know the evil as we know it now, and to be unaffected by the knowledge, will indeed make all worse instead of better.

F. LONDON :

This letter was followed in the same year (1885) by the Bishop's action in reference to the Church and Stage Guild. A deputation of the Society had waited upon him with a view of gaining his support in the work they were engaged in; but, after several interviews with the Honorary Secretary, the Rev. Stewart D. Headlam, the Bishop replied thus :—

FULHAM PALACE, S.W.,
October, 1885.

MY DEAR SIR—I have no objection to your bringing before the Church and Stage Guild the opinion that I have expressed concerning its aim and operation. The aim, as I understand it, is (1) To procure from the Christian Church the recognition

of what is good in the stage, and the recognition of the greatness of that good ; and (2) at the same time to remove from the stage what is evil. The operation of the Guild appears to me to lay very much stress on the first of these two aims, and very little on the second ; and in consequence of the neglect of the due proportion between these two there is a strong tendency to deny the existence of the evil. Now I believe the evil to be great. I believe there is much on the stage, and, in particular, in the ballet, which does grave mischief to many young men, possibly to many young women. The ballet does suggest what had better not be suggested, and I doubt if those who deny this are quite as decisive as they should be in condemning, not merely impure acts, but impure emotions and thoughts. My own personal experience of young men is very considerable, and I have no doubt whatever that a very large number of spectators of the ballet, even if they are quite able to prevent impurity from going into act, are nevertheless led into most disastrous sins of imagination. Nor, further, have I any doubt that the result is to encourage in young men the general opinion that a low standard of purity is natural and permissible in the male sex. I acquit the dancers from all share of the evil which affects the spectators. The dancers begin young and are, as it were, protected by long usage. They grow up thinking no harm, and they know no harm, though of course there are evil-minded among them ; but I have no reason to believe that the evil-minded are numerous. The innocence of the dancers, however, does not prevent the mischief to the spectators, and that, I repeat, is a very grave fact, whatever the Guild may say—Yours faithfully,

F. LONDON :

In answer to this a letter was drafted by the Guild, reminding the Bishop that the clergy had hitherto contented themselves with simply denouncing the evils of the stage ; that this they had done with no good result, and that what the Guild wanted them to do was to recognise the good, and by that means gradually oust the evil. The Bishop's reply was, "When you have persuaded the ballet-dancers to practise their art in proper clothing the case will be altered."

Dr. Temple was deeply interested in rescue work, but felt that little could be done under existing conditions. He complained that the clergy were reluctant to touch it, and that the laity disliked it even more. He felt that the work—important and essential though it was—was paralysed by a prevalent and unchristian spirit of prudery ; and he urged the employment of trained workers who should be fully competent to deal with the difficult problems of humanity presented to them. It was further his opinion that all the work—rescue, preventive, reformatory—should be linked together, especially rescue and reformatory.

With another vexed question—that of the relation of the clergy to party politics—the Bishop dealt in a lecture delivered at St. Michael's, Cornhill, in January 1895. He said :—

There is always a considerable difficulty in defining with any precision the relations between the things of this world and the things of the other ; because, on the one hand, there is a very serious danger that if these two are allowed to come into too close contact the things of the other world may seem to be absorbed in the cares of this ; and, on the other hand, there is a very great danger—perhaps the more serious danger of the two—that if the demarcation between them be made too strong the result will be that the principles of religion will be altogether excluded from their proper influence on our conduct in this life. It is unquestionable that it is intended that our religion should penetrate into all our ordinary conduct, and there should be nothing which we do as concerning this present life which is not very distinctly penetrated through and through by the spirit that belongs to the life that is to come. . . . Now the broad principle which must govern the position of any clergyman is this : that he is an ambassador for Christ, in order that he may speak of the things of Christ to the whole world. . . . This is the purpose of his ministry, and, having this purpose, he must always so conduct himself that it shall be made supreme over all that he does. . . . From this general principle I pass of necessity to the main application of it. How is the minister of the Gospel to do his work ? Plainly

enough he must do it by the life that he lives, which will be at once a precept and an example. He must enter into all the ordinary life of men, therefore, because in the ordinary life of men religious life must be perpetually the inspiring principle of the whole. He must take his share, as a citizen, in that which is required of all citizens. He must take his share in everything for which ordinary men are responsible, and for that reason he must enter into politics just as other men are called upon to enter into the same sphere. But, as he enters into politics, what will be the guiding rules of all that he has to do in that sphere? In the first place, he is bound to make it felt by those amongst whom he is living and amongst whom he is labouring that in whatever he does there is no self-seeking; there must be conspicuous a total absence of personal ambition, of personal vanity, of everything which takes him down from his high position as the ambassador for Christ. . . . Again, as he is to be an example of self-surrender, so too must he be an example of absolute fairness in dealing with all his fellow-men. . . . He is bound as a Christian to recognise that other men have consciences as well as himself, and that other men are under the command of their consciences as he also ought to be of his. He is bound to be conspicuously fair in acknowledging the right of other men to their own opinions. He is bound to take care that, if he condemns, he condemns the principle to which he is opposed, and never assigns to any man motives of a lower kind than he would assign to himself. . . . And yet, though it is his duty to make religion penetrate into politics so far as he possibly can, he is bound, on the other hand, to take care that politics shall never absorb religion. He must make men feel that though he takes his part as a man in political life, he is never so engrossed by politics that his political action is to put aside his religious purpose. He must never allow it to be said that he has forgotten his commission, even for a moment, because he has been so absorbed in any political movement whatever that the higher cause is for the time being shut out. . . . It is wrong for him at any time to make the ministrations of religion subordinate to any political purpose whatever. In the church it is best that he should always remember that there the things of this world are so absolutely subordinate to the things of the other that there never shall be a moment's doubt that the things of the other world are filling his mind—filling it entirely. . . . Speaking generally,

there can be no question that within the church everything should be calm, peaceful, heavenly; that within the church every one who is present in the congregation should feel that the minister is commissioned by Christ to speak to him. . . . If the minister offends and vexes by what he says, he has not really helped men to come nearer to Christ than they were before; on the contrary, he has done something to drive them away. . . . It is therefore better that all his own special opinions and views should be put out of sight in church, and that there he should teach those high principles about which there cannot be any real question amongst religious men—those high principles, I mean, which especially mark the Christian character. Our Lord laid down a rule for all conduct in this world when He said that there was always a region in which His Kingdom was “not of this world,” a region from which the affairs of this world should be wisely excluded. . . . In a word, the clergyman will join in politics in his capacity as an ambassador for Christ, and, consequently, there will be a place and a time when in that character he will leave politics aside to speak of something that must always be for him, and for all men, higher than any politics whatsoever.

Early in May 1885 the Bishop opened up his vigorous crusade against intemperance in London by a speech in Exeter Hall, which was crowded in every part, in which he said :—

One reason why I have accepted the office of Bishop of London is the hope that that office might bring me into more direct contact with great masses of my fellow-countrymen, and that I might find more opportunity of fulfilling the injunction which the Church laid upon me when I was consecrated a Bishop, viz. that I should always have special regard to the poor. The cause of this Society (the Total Abstinence Section of the C.E.T.S.) is emphatically the cause of the great mass of the people. It is not that the poor are more intemperate than others, but it is that intemperance has a more certain and a more deadly effect upon them and upon their position. If by labouring amongst the poor I could make them in the slightest degree find it easier to win for themselves a more religious and more moral condition by casting out their temptations and provocations to intemperance, then indeed I should feel I

was doing a bishop's work—a true superintendence of the religious life of the people at large.

On January 14, 1886, the Bishop inaugurated the political side of his temperance campaign in the Metropolis at a meeting to welcome the newly-elected members of Parliament who were total abstainers, at which he said that he did not suppose that all they wished done could be done by legislation, but they wanted legislation to give them an open space in which they could work, and, if possible, restrict the temptations in every way.

He was always in favour of going as fast as they could, without destroying the cause by trying to go too fast. He was ready to take any instalment of a restriction of the liquor traffic, however small, as he thought that the swell of the tide was quite certain to carry them beyond any mere temporary instalment. He was not in the mind to refuse anything offered because it was not enough.

His views of the possibilities of legislation were eminently sane and practical, as is demonstrated by the following extract from a remarkable speech made at the opening of the new headquarters of the C.E.T.S. at Dean's Gate, Westminster, in November 1892 :—

There will be, of course, those who will fight very hard for leaving things as they are. I do not think myself that they will take the line of *saying*, You had better leave things as they are. What they will do will be rather to try whether they cannot get all the different proposals and bang their heads one against the other, and see whether by knocking them together they can knock all the wits out. We shall find, I think, in the variety of remedies for the evil of the present state of things a very great probability that there will be a difficulty in carrying anything at all. . . . I think that in temperance legislation we have very often made a mistake by not being ready to accept a little, and consequently we have got nothing, and have had to start afresh. In the present day we have gained this—that there is a tolerably general conviction that something must be done.

His Lordship did not advise even extreme men, however, to begin by giving up their extreme views.

I myself in one way am generally called rather an extreme man—that is, a great many of my friends tell me over and over again that I press total abstinence a great deal too hard. But I feel that I am only doing what I am bound to do, because it is my own conviction that it is the right course to take. But there are others who take similarly extreme views with which I do not agree at all. Thus, for instance, in the great conflict that there was last year over the proposals of Mr. Goschen, I was very strongly in favour of compensation to the publican, and I held to it fast, and shall fight for it hard. . . . When I say that A thinks B grievously mistaken I do not quite see that B is wrong; but when I am A I do see it. I cannot help thinking there must be a good many people in the same position as myself. I remember, a good many years ago, when I was a Fellow of Balliol College, Oxford, we discussed some matter in the Common Room, and when it came to the vote there were 6 to 5. A very clever man was staying with me at the time—a Frenchman—and when we came out he asked me how the matter had gone, and I told him. He said, “It strikes me that in most English assemblies it is a case of about 6 to 5”; and, so far as I know Englishmen at all, if you come to look inside them it is generally really a case of six to five in regard to any subject. The six ought to prevail over the five, and I rather sympathise with what Jessell, one of our most remarkable judges, said in one of his judgments. He began by remarking: “I have no doubt—but that perhaps must not count for very much because I never have any doubt.” If we proceed upon the basis of respecting one another’s consciences we are bound to do right. . . . When we have once come to a conclusion as to what is the best thing to do, we must be as resolute in supporting that view as if it was the only one which each of us cared to uphold. That is the temper in which we ought to approach the Legislature on this matter.

Nothing was more remarkable in Temple’s attitude towards the temperance question, than the way in which he carried out the principle advocated above: “*If we proceed upon the basis of respecting one another’s consciences we are bound to do right.*”

He never credited his opponents with bad or false motives : he never condescended to the employment in his speeches of unsound or claptrap arguments ; he never made exaggerated statements, nor allowed his enthusiasm for a great cause to blind his sense of justice. Let the following words witness to the truth of this statement.

Presiding over the meetings of the Council of the C.E.T.S. Societies at Nottingham in October 1893, he confessed that—

In regard to compensation he held views which would not be accepted by the great mass of temperance reformers. The State had practically encouraged a large number of people to embark in a certain business, and, if that business turned out to be mischievous, they were bound to make some compensation where they required it to be given up. At the same time he knew it was practically impossible to pay compensation in the way he should himself prefer, namely, out of public money ; but, as some public-houses would gain, in any scheme of reduction, by the suppression of other houses, it appeared to him perfectly equitable that the particular gainers should compensate the losers, and on these lines it was hoped that a measure might be passed.

Or again, on another occasion, he gave utterance to the following sentiment :—

If the total abstainer tells me that he thinks that drinking wine is in itself a sin, or that the Bible forbids it, I shall tell him in reply that I am sure he is mistaken. If he refuses to work with me, or if he insists on attacking me unless I agree with him, I shall not therefore cease to practise and to preach total abstinence as the best remedy for present evils, but I shall ask him to consider whether his cause will gain by going off to what is not our present concern—the grappling with a terrible mischief, for which the best and only available remedy* is total abstinence.

A third instance of this honest, truth-loving spirit which animated the Bishop's advocacy of temperance will be found in his closing words on

the subject, spoken at Hampton-on-Thames on the eve of his leaving the Diocese :—

I have been a hard-working man myself for many years, and I did not find when I gave up intoxicating liquors that my health and strength or power to labour were impaired. Amongst educated people I think the idea that they are necessary is pretty well gone. You may remember a physician writing to *The Times*, a few years ago, who admitted that total abstainers might live a little longer than other people, but urged what miserable lives they led. "Look," he said, "at their pale faces, their emaciated bodies" (*laughter*). Well, I think we can show some total abstainers to whom that criticism does not apply; but I do not think the knowledge I have spoken about has yet reached all the working classes as much as it should do. There still prevails in the minds of many of them the idea that intoxicating liquors will give them additional strength to do good work. These persons must be answered by others of their own class who can do so. We do want the Government sooner or later—and we shall get it for certain—to diminish the enormous number of temptations by which people are now surrounded. . . . I confess that I very often do not agree with some of the things that are said on temperance platforms. I cannot agree with those who say that if a man touches intoxicating liquor at all he is sure to get worse and worse. I have drunk intoxicating liquor for a good many years of my life, though five-and-twenty years ago I gave it up altogether; but I have never at any time felt that I could not check or control myself in the use of it. Then why did I become a total abstainer? Because when I looked into the social condition of the country, and particularly of those who are nearest to my own heart,—the men who live by the labour of their hands and the sweat of their bodies,—I felt that the best thing I could do for them was to fight the battle side by side with them against this terrible evil that is ever driving them down.

As Chairman of the Church of England Temperance Society, Dr. Temple was mainly instrumental in carrying out a much-needed reform in the constitution of that body. In 1892 he addressed a circular to the Diocesan branches of the Society,

and to all its members, in which, after pointing out that it held a unique position among societies advocating the temperance cause, he expressed the opinion that it did not exercise a power and influence corresponding to its character.

This lack of power in proportion to its character (he wrote) is mainly due to the looseness of its organisation. . . . The proposals for reorganisation which I have submitted to the Executive and the Council, and which have been accepted by them, are intended, if possible, to remedy these defects. The first purpose of those proposals is to do away with the distinctions heretofore maintained between the parent society and the branches. There is now to be no separate parent society. The Society henceforth consists of the branches, and the branches in their union constitute the Society. The Executive is the organ of the united branches; the Council is their supreme legislature. . . . The second purpose of my proposals is to put the government of the Society into the hands of those who take an active interest in its operations and their success. No society can have much weight if many of its members are half-hearted in their support of it and of its aims. There can be no doubt that there are members of our Society who cherish a languid opinion in its favour, think its work commendable, and yet feel little enthusiasm in the cause themselves, and are inclined to damp it in others. . . . I am firmly convinced that the Society under this new constitution will be more closely united and more vigorous in its action, and union and vigour are the conditions of success in such work as ours.

In the previous year (1891) a special effort had been made to increase the number of children belonging to Bands of Hope, and the following "Appeal to Parents on behalf of their Children" was penned by the Bishop:—

We ask parents, even if they are not already, and have no intention of becoming, total abstainers, to consider whether it will not be better for their children to remain quite free from the risks and temptations that they will have to face if they become accustomed to use intoxicating liquors. Very

few indeed will now maintain that children need these stimulants, or are in any respect the better for using them. On the other hand, it is a well-known fact that many have a natural weakness in this direction, and if they once begin will hereafter find it exceedingly difficult to stop till they have gone on from moderate indulgence to excess. And further, where there is no such natural weakness, the customary use of intoxicating liquors exposes many a young man to serious temptation from foolish companions, who would have no power to lead him wrong if he had never begun to indulge himself in that way.

And besides the consideration of what is best for the children themselves, with a view to their happiness and success in life, is it not something to join in the noble endeavour to help the whole body of working men to get rid of that intemperance which is often so dreadful a curse to themselves and their families? Those who have no difficulty in keeping themselves sober ought to have some feeling for others that are weaker. And it is a noble and Christian thing to give up an indulgence of this kind in order to join in the great battle against intemperance; and even children can do their part in this, and if they begin to do their part as children they will be still better able to do what they can for their fellows when they are grown up.

Children are a sacred trust, given to parents by their Creator, to be brought up to live pure and godly lives. We are taught to pray for ourselves that we be not led into temptation. But how much more reason have we to fear temptation for the little ones who have not yet the knowledge to see what is best, nor the strength to choose it! When they are older we shall have to leave them to the guidance of their own consciences, and they must decide for themselves what they will do in regard to drinking intoxicating liquors, as in regard to all their other conduct. But meanwhile it is our duty to keep them from anything which may make it hereafter difficult for them to do what their consciences may then tell them to be their duty.

We beg of you to let your children at once join a Band of Hope or a Juvenile Temperance Society. It is now easy; it might hereafter turn out to be necessary, and then be very difficult. It cannot do them any harm. It may be, we believe it will be, an incalculable blessing. It is certain that if they join they will have better health of body. It is nearly certain that they will be better in soul and spirit; for

though nothing but the grace of God can give health to the soul, yet it is much to remove all hindrances to the effectual working of that grace, and of such hindrances intemperance is known to be one of the worst. Let us keep even the possibility of intemperance far away from our children, and leave no chance that we should ever have to fear hereafter that it has been our fault that they have fallen into sin, or have barely escaped from doing so. It is quite certain that no parent will ever regret that he has kept from his children throughout their childhood what is utterly useless to all children, dangerous to very many, and ruinous to not a few!

F. LONDIN :

(Chairman of the Church of England
Temperance Society).

A burning question, which has since unhappily been assuming more serious proportions, gave him much anxious thought. In October 1892 he granted an interview to a reporter from the office of the *Daily Telegraph*, which had published a long correspondence on the subject of the increase of intemperance among women, and wished to obtain a statement of his views. Dr. Temple began the conversation by a reference to the provision of greater facilities for secret drinking, which many correspondents had affirmed to exist. The Bishop had always held this to be the case, but wanted particulars. The answer pointed to grocers' licences, which Bishop Fraser considered innocent of the evil, and also to the existence of drinking clubs or cliques of women. "There is no doubt," observed Dr. Temple, "that women show much less reluctance to be seen drinking, and drinking in public-houses, than they did. That is one of the worst symptoms of the mischief. It seems to me that it has grown out of the fact that so many of them have habituated themselves to drinking in secret, and gradually lost their aversion to entering places where they may be noticed." It being suggested that the growth of drinking habits

may be due to the dull monotony of life in congested districts, the Bishop said :—

I should not have thought it was due to that. I should have said that the monotony of life in congested districts was not really very oppressive. The certainty of having some one to talk to, with the opportunity of joining in what may be going on, is enough to prevent anything like monotony. I have personally known instances of very poor and respectable people who have lived in districts of the kind in great poverty, and who have been assisted to go into the country, and have been there placed in positions where, as industrious folk, they could live very comfortably so far as food, clothing, and housing were concerned. But they would not stay, because they found the country so dull in comparison with London. These people were not victims of drink. I am merely quoting their experience as examples of those who, so far from finding life in congested localities very monotonous and dull, found that it supplied them with a very considerable amount of excitement—excitement, I mean, independent of the public-house. My opinion on this head is identical with that long ago expressed by Dr. Johnson. At the same time I readily allow that the people want better means of recreation than they have at present. Yet, if places of recreation are to be supplied with an abundance of liquor they will be no whit better than the public-houses—

a remark which indicated a material difference from the Bishop of Chester's view.

Dr. Temple went on to speak of religious influences as alone likely to effect an ultimate cure. He thought that "a State home for habitual drunkards, in which they should be compulsorily detained, would only touch the fringe of the evil."

Another practical utterance was that on "Our Social Manners and Customs"—a theme which he selected for his New Year's address to the Church of England Temperance Society, delivered in St. Philip's Parochial Hall, Buckingham Palace Road, on January 2, 1893.

One of the greatest obstacles to the advance of temperance principles is to be found in the ordinary customs of society, more particularly at this festive season ; and it is astonishing how that disagreeable sentiment which mixes up drink with social gatherings permeates the usages, and even the literature and melody, of the nation. I myself have heard a lot of Scotchmen sing away at "Auld Lang Syne" with such gusto and hearty earnestness that I have in a weak moment really been half tempted to join in and drink "a cup of kindness" with them—so carried away have I been by their wild enthusiasm. The fact is we should turn the tables. If two-thirds of the population would only become abstainers, then it would be the balance who would seem odd and strange.

The Bishop's intervention as a mediator in the famous Dockers' Strike of 1889 will be remembered by many, for there were those who considered at the time that his action was ineffectual and unsatisfactory.

The following brief account of the circumstances is supplied by Mr. Sydney Buxton, M.P. :—

The great Dock Strike began on August 14, 1889, and was not brought to a final conclusion till September 14. The movement hung fire at first ; and, for a few days, it appeared as if it would wane and flicker out like previous attempts of the same sort. Suddenly, however, it caught on. The whole of the skilled labour employed in the docks and riverside industries determined to support their less fortunate brethren. They came out "on principle" and "in sympathy," content, if the "Docker got his tanner," to go back to work at the instant at the old terms. They gave strength, life, and backbone to the struggle. The strike gathering strength day by day, finally, and within an incredibly short space of time, involved some 80,000 workers, and brought the whole business of the Port of London to an absolute standstill. But some recognised authority was required from whence effective intervention could practically proceed. Public opinion pointed to the Mansion House as the place, and to the Lord Mayor as the authority. But the Lord Mayor was away. However, on the following Thursday night, just a week after the first intervention, the Lord Mayor came back to town, and at once acted promptly and effectively.

He immediately summoned to his counsel and aid those who were subsequently styled the "Mansion House Committee of Conciliation," and proceeded to use his own personal influence, and the still more powerful influence of his position, to bring the strike to an end. The Committee, as at first constituted, and at its first meeting (on September 6), consisted of the Lord Mayor (Sir James Whitehead), Cardinal Manning, the Bishop of London (Dr. Temple), who had come back from North Wales specially for the purpose, Sir John Lubbock (as representing the Chamber of Commerce), Lord Brassey, who, however, was not personally able to be present, Sir Andrew Lusk, and Mr. Sydney Buxton. The formation of a strong Committee under such auspices gave the public, at once, a confident belief that the dispute was as good as settled.

And, at first, these anticipations seemed about to be realised. The Committee, after due deliberation, came to the conclusion that the men's demands ought, in substance, to be conceded by the Joint Committee of Dock Directors. But they also considered that the Companies should be given some breathing time, a euphemistic bridge of retreat, before the rise of wages came into operation. A compromise—compromise is dear to the hearts of all Englishmen—was therefore suggested. As to the extent of this concession there was considerable difference of opinion on the Committee; and, finally, though by no means unanimously, March 1 was provisionally adopted for recommendation to both sides. The leaders of the men were then called into council. It was essential to know whether the men would be prepared to accept the suggested postponement before it was proposed to the Directors—of whose acceptance there was, however, under the circumstances, no grave doubt. Tillet and Burns, gladly accepting the intervention of the Conciliation Committee which seemed a precursor to peace with honour, at once responded to the summons to the Mansion House; Mann and Champion, also summoned, did not receive their notice in time to attend. The two leaders argued, however, strongly against the long postponement, declaring that the proposition would be almost certainly rejected by the men, particularly as a considerable number of the wharfingers had already conceded the immediate penny. "I appeal to your Eminence," said Burns, "and to you, my Lord Bishop, and to Mr. Buxton, whether the men in this strike have not behaved with 'sweet reasonableness'?"

"My son, they have," said Cardinal Manning. "Then," cried Burns, "I do not think they ought to be asked to wait until March 1 for this small advance." Finally, after long discussion, January 1 was suggested; and under the influence of the Mansion House surroundings, of the moderating yet sympathetic language of the Cardinal, of the triumph of assured victory, this date was provisionally accepted for recommendation to the men by their leaders if the Dock Directors on their part could be got to agree.

Thereupon, that evening—the Friday—the Lord Mayor, the Cardinal, and the Bishop waited on the Dock Directors, who agreed to consider and to decide on the proposals the following day. The following day, Saturday, was again an all-day and late-into-the-night sitting at the Mansion House, and a day full of hope, anxiety, and disappointment. It was not until four o'clock in the afternoon, after what seemed endless hours and hours of weary and anxious waiting, enlivened by occasional excursions and alarums, that the Conciliation Committee—consisting on this occasion of the Lord Mayor, the Cardinal, the Bishop of London, and Mr. Buxton—received the reply of the joint Committee. Grudgingly, and of necessity, they had decided to accept the proposals of the Conciliation Committee, on condition that the Strike Committee on their part accepted the terms that very evening. Great was the relief, great the congratulations. Both sides appeared to be agreed. The strike appeared to be at an end. Messrs. Tillett and Burns were in attendance; the contents of the letter were immediately communicated to them, and off they hastened to tell the news to the Strike Committee. But a compromise that, at the first blush, and in the calm atmosphere of the Mansion House, had appeared fairly satisfactory, took a different aspect in the more heated and discordant atmosphere of "Wade Arms." The pros and cons—especially the cons—were eagerly and hotly discussed. The objections to the lengthy postponement were many and weighty. By January 1 the busy time would be over; the arrears of work would have been finished. The extra money was sorely needed at once. Some of the wharves had already conceded, and were actually paying the sixpence. The men would certainly refuse the proposal. The Committee had no power, at such short notice and without further representative consultation, to pledge themselves or the men. Finally, between ten and eleven o'clock at night—Saturday night—a letter was sent to the Mansion House. The Conciliation

Committee, who were sadly and ever more anxiously—for the delay in reply boded no good—endeavouring to wile away the long and lengthening hours, opened the letter with hope and eagerness; only to find that the Strike Committee declared it impossible, without a full consultation of all concerned, and at such short notice, to decide anything. This was a terrible disappointment; accentuated and aggravated by a manifesto—manifestoes frequent and free were the order of the day—which appeared on the following Sunday morning, stating that the men declined to accept the proposed compromise.

Tillett and Burns were thereupon roundly accused of bad faith and of double dealing. The Lord Mayor, the Bishop of London, and Cardinal Manning—the last with reluctance—signed a joint letter of expostulation and explanation. The incident, unfortunate and perilous, was, I verily believe myself, due to mutual misunderstanding.

However, for the moment, the occurrence seemed to destroy any hope of successful conciliation. The principal members of the Mansion House Committee repudiated the leaders; the Bishop of London went back to Wales; the Lord Mayor was preparing to leave town; Burns, haranguing the men on the Sunday in Hyde Park, declared that he wanted no more mediation, negotiations, or compromise; Tillett, more moderate, declared he would concede as far as October 1, but not a day further. The Dock Directors were understood to have withdrawn their acceptance of the January proposal. Blank despair seized on the public mind. This was on the Sunday—and a miserable Sunday it was for all concerned. But the Cardinal, grievously disappointed though he had been, was not going to allow any rebuff or any false pride to stand in the way of success. That afternoon he sent for Tillett; and, readily accepting his explanations, he communicated with the Lord Mayor, who was also seen by Tillett, and who, at last, finally agreed to make one further effort to bring about a settlement.

On Monday afternoon, therefore, a full conference of the Mansion House Committee was held—the Bishop of London being the only absentee, he being unable to return from Wales—and the men were, on this occasion, represented not only by Burns and Tillett, but by the other principal leaders. Mann, Champion, Toomey, Walsh, and Iles; the signators of the no-compromise manifesto.

Canon Mason,¹ then vicar of All Hallows, Barking, near the Tower, in whose parish the great strike meetings were held, writes as follows :—

CANTERBURY,
August 1, 1904.

I write from abroad, without any notes at hand to guide me with regard to dates; but I think that I looked and found that I kept no diary at the time to help me. Some things, however, I remember very vividly.

Naturally, all in our house were greatly interested in the strike,—more so as the daily meeting of the strikers was held in our parish, just under the big warehouse at the east end of All Hallows' Church. Cyril Bickersteth and Reginald Adderley (if I remember right), who were then among my coadjutors, were the first secretaries of the Christian Social Union; and G. C. Fletcher was also deeply interested in all such questions.

The Bishop was away at Dolgelly, and (as his manner was) had shown no public sign of feeling on the question. He was biding his time, regardless of paragraphs in the papers and speeches of partisans which pointed out that he was enjoying himself in Wales and the Archbishop of Canterbury in Switzerland while the population of his diocese was convulsed by this strife. We too were biding our time; and at last it seemed to us—I forget what gave the signal—that the moment was come when the Bishop might usefully intervene. There was no time to be lost, and I remember Bickersteth seizing my purse, jumping into a cab, and contriving to get in nineteen minutes from Tower Hill to Euston station, and just catching the night train down into North Wales. He had hoped to *bring* the Bishop back with him. The Bishop would not come that day, but promised to come the day after, and did so. Bickersteth found him, as one would expect, perfectly acquainted with every phase of the dispute, and letting not an item pass unobserved and unstudied.

Before coming to London, the Bishop telegraphed to me to get the Lord Mayor to meet him. The Lord Mayor (Sir James Whitehead) was away in the North, and telegraphed back to me that he did not think that the moment was come at which anything could be effectively done; but I telegraphed

¹ Now Master of Pembroke College, Cambridge.

back that the Bishop now thought otherwise and was returning at once. Sir James was persuaded, and came.

I met the Bishop next morning, at his desire, and went with him to the Mansion House. We were met there by Cardinal Manning and Mr. Sydney Buxton, and (I think) by Sir John Lubbock (as he then was). Neither then nor afterwards was I at any of the consultations between these distinguished men, nor can I give any account of the line which the Bishop took in the discussions. I used to attend him to and fro, and sometimes went on messages for him to the strike leaders and others. He frequently came to our house to write letters and that kind of thing, and on (I think) the first day of his being in London, he met Mr. John Burns in our house. We were all allowed to be present; and it may be imagined how interesting it was to hear the two strong men talking things over together. The Bishop was not only fully possessed of the facts of the dispute of the moment, but he brought with him a clear and detailed recollection of a similar dock strike which had taken place—I forget the date, but I think it must have been forty years before—of which none of us, I think, had ever heard before, not even Burns. The points which I remember the Bishop labouring at with Mr. Burns were (1) to make him feel the value of individual freedom, and (2) to bring him to face clearly the fact that the effect of making the dock-labourers a permanent body of fairly paid men was to throw the great mass of the casual labourers upon the workhouse and the rates, and to draw out from him the avowal of his conviction that this was in the circumstances the desirable thing to do. Beyond this I have no distinct recollection of the line which the Bishop took. My chief recollections are of the anecdotic kind. For instance, I remember his expatiating to me upon the difference between the various forms of intimidation. He was very strongly opposed, as you would imagine, to intimidation that actually hindered a man by main violence from doing a piece of work which he wished to do, “but,” he added, “if it is only a case of doing *that*”—and he shook his great finger in my face with a terrible scowl—“no man with a good conscience *ought* to be intimidated by it.” I was very glad that he was only illustrating his meaning, and not actually threatening me.

One day he was very full of a visit which he and the rest of the conciliators had paid to the board of directors of the Docks Company, where a member of the board had treated

them to a prolonged discourse upon the rise and history as well as the nature of Socialism, telling them that it had its origin in Germany, and a great deal more which the Bishop felt that they could have done without. "It reminded me," he said,—“you will think me very unkind—but it reminded me of nothing so much as the Bishop of ——” (naming a particular friend of mine). “I remember once,” he continued, “saying to the Archbishop (Benson), ‘It is a pity that the Bishop of —— *preaches* to us so much in Convocation.’” “Yes,” the Archbishop answered, “and he forgets that he is preaching to twenty-three of the hardest hearts in Christendom.”

I was waiting one day in the hall at the Mansion House, with almost breathless expectation, for a reply to come from the strike leaders to some proposal of the conciliators, when one of the Lord Mayor’s footmen came up to me and said, “It’s very exciting, isn’t it, sir? It’s almost as exciting as the decision of the Maybrick case!”

On one of those days I gave the Bishop my arm crossing the bottom of Trafalgar Square, and he took it. “I slipped here some time ago,” he said, “and fell. Before I knew where I was, there were three policemen on the top of me. I said, ‘Now would there have been three of you to help me, if you hadn’t seen by my dress that I was a Bishop?’” “No, my Lord.” “But I suppose *one* of you would have come to help me?” “I don’t know, my Lord.” That shows the way these men think.”

I never knew him more full of sagacious observations than he was during those days. I remember his dwelling at length upon the generosity of City men, whose incomes are continually expanding, and contrasting them with persons of fixed income, who are “daily more and more incrustated with responsibilities.” I forget what brought the subject on, but he was expounding one day the different standards by which men are governed, according to the class they belong to, and how important it is in judging them to know what that standard is; and he went on to say how the same man will have different standards for different departments of conduct, and how, for instance, a man upon whose word you might have absolute reliance in matters of business would tell a hundred lies to deceive a woman.

As soon as the main lines of the settlement were made, the Bishop returned to his holiday. It is, I dare say, true that the strikers themselves had won the main part of their cause before

the ecclesiastics intervened ; but the intervention at any rate brought about peace more quickly than it would otherwise have come—and especially the intervention of the Bishop of London. If the Bishop had not come, the Lord Mayor would not have come ; and if the Lord Mayor had not come, I much doubt whether Manning's somewhat one-sided interposition might not even have delayed matters.

No doubt Cardinal Manning deserves all the credit he received for his perseverance in the matter ; but it must be remembered that he possessed in a pre-eminent degree those diplomatic qualities which were singularly adapted for such a crisis. Dr. Temple was *not* diplomatic. He considered, rightly or wrongly, that towards the close of the negotiations the representatives of the dockers were not playing straight, and that was enough for him. He believed that the terms proposed were fair and that they had been made with the approval of the recognised leaders of the men, and when he left the Mansion House he felt that (appearances notwithstanding) the end was not really far off.¹

Of two notices in Archbishop Benson's diary, the second answers the first :—

September 17, 1889. "Cardinal Manning has done well for London. But why has my dear Bishop of London gone back and left it to him? Are the dockers on strike Roman Catholics all?"

February 14, 1890. "The Bishop of London, tenderest-hearted, most self-denying, most enduring and patient, most laborious of men, has no credit in this blind London for anything, simply because he will not say or do one thing with

¹ *The Story of the Dockers' Strike*, by H. Llewellyn Smith and Vaughan Nash, kindly lent me by Mr. John Burns, M.P., clearly shows that the Bishop was justified in his view of the situation—though he did not realise (for they had not then been fully explained to the Conciliation Committee) the reasons that made January 1 such an impossible date from the men's point of view. No doubt, in default of such explanation, the Dock Directors' plea for three months' grace to arrange their finances seemed absolutely fair.

The Bishop and Mr. Burns entertained a mutual regard for each other.

the idea that men should think well of him. He, alas, is going blind—will not spare himself one toil or hour—and London will not see till he has lost his sight and they have lost him.”

It was not the Bishop's way to make religious capital out of a dock strike. He left such honour and glory as there was, even as he left the diplomacy, to those who cared about them.

His care for the poor was at all times deep, wise, and practical. In Fulham, where the waterside population can compete with the worst parts of the East End in ungodliness, he “worked diligently for an improvement in the morals and welfare of the most debased class of the working-men who do no work; and his departure, just at a time when his example was being recognised by those who might have been considered unreclaimable, roused many to a truer sense of his worth and his good faith in the possibilities of making silk purses from the ears of swine.”

It was due to Bishop Temple's generosity and public spirit that an important enlargement was made to Bishop's Park, Fulham, and a recreation ground of about twelve acres provided for the use of the public for ever.¹ The following account of the formation of this beautiful park is extracted from Feret's *Fulham, Old and New*.²

At the instance of Bishop Jackson, the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, as Lords of the Manor of Fulham, on August 7, 1884, conveyed the freehold of the “Bishop's Meadow” to the Fulham District Board of Works, on the condition that the land should be laid out and maintained as a public recreation ground.

For some time no definite scheme was adopted by the Board either for the embankment or for the conversion of the site into a recreation ground. On the dissolution of the

¹ See also Dr. Temple's action in relation to the Archbishop's Park at Lambeth. “Primacy” Memoir, pp. 265, 266.—Ed.

² Vol. iii. pp. 211, 212.

Board, on March 25, 1886, the land was, by an order of the Secretary of State, dated March 3, 1887, conveyed to the newly constituted Vestry of Fulham. During 1887 preliminary steps were taken towards the embanking and laying out of the meadow, and the sanction of the Thames Conservancy to the present frontage-line was obtained. In March 1889 the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, at the instance of Dr. Temple, then Bishop of London, made the Vestry an additional grant of the West Meadow, thus bringing the total area of the proposed recreation ground to about twelve acres. During the following year the Vestry negotiated with the London County Council with the object of inducing that body to take over the Bishop's and West Meadows as a public park, to carry out the embankment and to lay out the grounds as a Metropolitan improvement. This the Council were unable to do, but they eventually met the Vestry by making a contribution of £5000 towards the cost. Plans were then prepared for the erection of a river wall of concrete to skirt the whole frontage of the site. The contract for its erection was given to the late Mr. Joseph Mears, the amount being £12,617:15:10. Bishop's Park was formally opened by Mr. (now Sir) John Hutton, Chairman of the London County Council, on December 22, 1893.

Dr. Temple also gave up, or rather declined to take over, the strip of land to the north of the Palace along the Avenue, which former Bishops of London had rented from the Ecclesiastical Commissioners; and retired strictly within the moat, building a second lodge just inside the great gates.

His popularity with the poor may be illustrated by the following extract from a lady's letter:—

I was present one evening when the Bishop preached in an unfashionable and unpatronised part of London. It was the Dedication Festival. The Church was in several senses "high," and the neighbourhood was somewhat turbulent, but the Vicar and his flock loved the Bishop, who had been good to them and had come to them several times.

One of the Bishop's nieces went with me, and she was to drive back to Fulham with her uncle. He had only returned to London that day, after a series of temperance meetings in the West of England. He came without a chaplain, and

he allowed no sign of fatigue to appear as he spoke strong, heart-felt words to the toiling men and women who packed the church. It was nine o'clock when the service ended, and I felt a qualm of dismay when I thought of the long walk alone to my underground station. My home lay on the way to Fulham. The people were in no hurry to leave the church; they wanted to see the last of their friend. As the Bishop—preceded by the vicar—squeezed through the throng and passed close to where we were standing near the door, the boldness of despair came upon me, and I whispered, "My Lord, will you save me from this hurly-burly." A little nod, his arm held so that I could slip my hand within it and a *look* reassured me instantly. The niece said afterwards, almost enviously, "Did you see *what* a sweet smile Uncle Freddy gave you?" I replied, "It was worth all the journey and more"—she was a special niece.

Outside the church the crowd was great; the episcopal carriage and horses seemed mixed up with coster barrows with their flaring torches and costermen and women. "There's the footman and the bag. There's the *laidies*, and there's the old gentleman himself, God bless him!" "Good-night, sir! God bless you!" came from all sides, while rough, kind faces were thrust in at the windows. And then that unique, dear voice rang back with a genial "Good-night" to all, and we drove away.

CHAPTER VII

BISHOP TEMPLE'S WORK IN CONVOCATION 1885-1896

Royal Commission on Housing of the Working Classes—Polygamy in heathen lands—Report on the functions of Queen Anne's Bounty Office—The unpaid diaconate—Relations with Lower House—Marriage Act Amendment Act—Betting and gambling—Thanks of Convocation in connexion with the Education Bill of 1890—Mission to Convocation of York—Interpretation of the Act of Uniformity Amendment Act—Church Patronage Bill, 1893—Working of the Conscience Clause in schools—Report of Joint Committee on Secondary Education—Obituary notices in Convocation.

THE indices of the twelve volumes of the Chronicle of Convocation, covering the twelve years of Dr. Temple's London Episcopate, reveal the very considerable extent of his contributions to the deliberations of the Upper House.

In 1885 he took a leading part in the discussion of the first Report of the Royal Commission on the Housing of the Working Classes, maintaining that the Ecclesiastical Commissioners ought to set an example as landlords, and declaring that 'there was no other Bishop who had taken quite so keen an interest in overcrowding and its attendant evils as he had himself.' In the same year he advocated the formation of Sisterhoods requiring no vow or life-engagement, but accepting offers of voluntary service for limited periods of time.

In 1886, during the debates on Church Reform, he gave it as his opinion that the Church would not be affected in its influence if it were stripped of its possessions altogether, though it might have to drop much of the work it was now doing. At the same time he urged that God's providence had provided the Church with its property and endowments, and that Churchmen, being trustees for Him, had no right to consent to the alienation of one penny of what had been handed to them. He recommended the taxation of wealthy benefices to help poor ones, rather than the transfer of endowments,—a transfer which was always unpopular to the parishioners of the parish despoiled.

On quite another question—that of polygamy in heathen lands—he said that it should be determined mainly by consulting the practice of the Primitive Church. Slavery was dealt with by the Early Church very leniently until the wrong gradually disappeared; but, as far as could be traced, the law of the Early Church relating to marriage was decidedly strict. He recollected that the late General Gordon, before going to Egypt, called on him, and asked whether it would be right in converting the natives to tell them that they would be allowed, though Christians, to have three wives apiece. He (the Bishop) said he did not think that could be allowed. Whereupon General Gordon exclaimed, "What a pity! I might convert all Africa with great ease if you would allow that."

In 1887 Dr. Temple presented what Archbishop Benson described as an admirably clear report explaining the functions of Queen Anne's Bounty, an explanation so useful as to be worth reproducing here:—

The Bounty-office has a double function to discharge. The primary duty of the Governors is to apply to the

augmentation of small livings the income derived from first-fruits and tenths paid by the holders of certain benefices. This income amounts to about £13,000 a year, grants from which are always made either for the improvement of parsonage-houses or of small livings, or (far more commonly) to increase their permanent endowments, by meeting benefactions given for the same purposes. The usual grant is £200 to meet a benefaction of £200. The £400 thus obtained is in some cases invested in land, which thenceforward becomes part of the freehold of the holder of the benefice. But it is frequently retained by the Governors, and invested in their name in securities of various kinds, the Governors undertaking to pay the holder of the benefice interest on the money so invested. The amount thus retained by the Governors is now very considerable, but it is obvious that it is trust money, held in trust for the clergy who hold the augmented benefices. Among the various modes in which the Governors are allowed to invest this trust-capital, they are empowered to lend it to the clergy on the security of their benefices for repairs and improvements of various kinds, and this investment of a portion of this trust-capital is a very important part of their business. It will be seen from this statement that the Bounty-office is first a grant-office, and, secondly, a loan-office. As a grant-office it administers a charity, and looks mainly to the poverty of the living which it is asked to augment. As a loan-office its primary duty is to see that in lending trust-money (which is in reality the property of the poorer clergy, for only small livings are augmented) full security is obtained for the replacement of the capital and the punctual payment of the interest. To allow the capital to be lost is to rob the benefices; to allow the interest to be lost is to rob the present holders. The applicants to the Bounty-office for loans seem often not to be aware of the double function of the office, and expect to get loans on easier terms, as if in making these loans the Governors were dealing not with trust-property belonging to the poorer Clergy, but with some fund placed at their disposal for the purpose of facilitating improvements and repairs of the property of all the clergy alike. But the Governors are never at liberty to forget whose money it is, and have no right to imperil it. The clergy may always borrow elsewhere, and give precisely the same security, and may thus have recourse to any lender, if they can find one who is

willing to lend on easier terms ; but, having some considerable acquaintance with the business of the board, we are of opinion that the Governors cannot lend at a lower rate than at present without in some degree endangering the absolute safety of the money which they hold in trust, and of the annual payments which they are bound to make to the holders of the augmented benefices.

In the debate on the Deacons Bill,¹ the Bishop carried a motion in favour of the following resolution which had been previously passed by the Upper House three years before :—

This House is of opinion that, in view of the overwhelming need of increase in the number of the ministry, and the impossibility of providing sufficient endowments for the purpose, it is expedient to ordain to the office of deacon men possessing other means of living who are willing to aid the clergy gratuitously, provided that they be tried and examined according to the Preface of the Ordinal, and in particular be found to possess a complete knowledge of the Holy Scriptures, of the Book of Common Prayer, and of theology in general ; provided also that they be in no case admitted to the priesthood unless they can pass all the examinations which are required in case of other candidates for that office, and that they shall have devoted their whole time to spiritual labour for not less than four years, unless they are graduates, before they present themselves for these examinations.

The Bishop pointed out that a broad distinction must be drawn between allowing or encouraging clergymen to assist in maintaining themselves by secular labour as St. Paul did, and admitting to the sacred ministry men already devoted to secular occupations and purposing to continue in their callings.

In 1888 a Committee of the Lower House had drawn up a series of Questions and Answers concerning and on the Church, for which the sanction of the Bishops was invited. The Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol reluctantly moved that this

¹ See "Exeter" Memoir, vol. i. pp. 501-503.—En.

sanction should be refused, a motion which Dr. Temple seconded in uncompromising terms:—

There were many occasions (he said) when it was quite competent and desirable for the Lower House to consider questions of doctrine; but to draw up formularies in the shape in which these Questions and Answers were presented to their lordships—that was, supplementary to so important a document as the Catechism of the Church—seemed to him to be going beyond the province of the Lower House altogether. If great need was felt for such a declaration, and the Church was being hurt because there was no distinct definition of the Church that could be used in instructing the young, an *articulus cleri* or *gravamen* would have been in regular order for the Lower House to send up; but the drawing up of a new formulary without any reference whatever to the Upper House seemed to him quite inconsistent with the constitutional relations of the two Houses. He did not mean to imply that the Lower House intended a slight, or to do anything in the nature of a trick or device, or that they desired to interfere with the rights of the Bishops; but though it was not intentional, the fact remained the same. As the Upper House was entrusted with the governance of the Church, they were bound to take care that they did not in any way sacrifice the rights of the Bishops to take the initiative in the drawing up of all formularies bearing on Church doctrine.

In submitting, in 1889, the draft bill for the amendment of the Marriage Act of 4 George IV. cap. 76, the Bishop urged the following considerations:—

It appears to me that the principle of the old law would be very much better observed if the conditions of marrying were changed in three ways. (1) I think the banns of marriage ought to be published in the usual and permanent place of residence of the parties. It is only there that the banns can be any effectual check on clandestine marriages. The allowing people to take lodgings for fifteen days is practically now a cover for clandestine marriage: and the only way you can secure that the marriage should be what it ought to be, a public ceremony in *facie ecclesiae*—and that it shall be known beforehand, so that persons can interfere—such

as parents in the case of minors, and so on—is to make the parties have their banns published in the district in which they live and are well known. But (2) it seems to me that, having required the publication in the ordinary place of residence, there is no reason at all why the marriage itself should not be celebrated in any other church in the diocese. This change would certainly be looked upon as a great boon by the laity if they were allowed to choose their own church for the celebration of marriages. I want to alter the law so as to make it more stringent with regard to the publication of banns, and less stringent in respect to the solemnisation of the marriage itself. . . . (3) At the same time it is necessary to look at what closely affects most of the clergy, the question of fees. We cannot introduce a Bill of this sort without taking the opportunity to fix the fees once and for all. I do not think it is right there should be such an enormous variation in the charges as there is at present. In a very large number of cases marriages are undoubtedly driven to the registrar's office simply because the fees charged in the church are so absolutely unreasonable.

In 1891, in the debate on betting and gambling, the Bishop took occasion to say :—

I confess I find it quite impossible to say to people that every time they play for small sums of money, or make small wagers, they are committing sins. I cannot see there is anything sinful in a small wager or in playing for small sums of money, except so far as anything of that sort may lead to excess in those who copy the example; and, of course, everything that tends towards excess is, in a sense, sinful. It may be quite right, for instance, that there should be formed—as I believe is already being done—a society pledged never to bet and never to play any games whatever for money. Such a society may be useful, but I do not think it would be possible to take the line that the thing is sinful in itself, and is to be avoided on that account. There is a little danger, I think, in our way of presenting this point; and such plain speaking from the pulpit as has been urged on us most certainly requires to be guarded very carefully lest too much be said, and, consequently, a great many people may be driven into a sort of reactionary feeling that the whole protest is silly. . . . I do not think it possible to question that the mischief and the temptations to mischief remain very serious indeed. I do not mean that there is as

much high play as there used to be, or that gambling in the sense of men ruining themselves at gambling tables in consequence of the enforcement to play high stakes is worse than it was fifty years ago; but I do think that the evil has extended very much more widely, and that there are very much larger numbers of people than there were who now gamble altogether beyond what is right, in the making of wagers and the playing games of chance for amounts which are inconsistent with anything like Christian principle in regard to the expenditure of money. The evil is very serious, and it is only too likely to lead to still further evils, which will be attended, and which have been attended in times past, with stealing for purposes of gambling.

Dr. Temple's splendid work in Convocation in connexion with the Education Bill of 1890 received special acknowledgment; for on July 1, 1891, the Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol (Dr. Ellicott), rising in his place, said he believed it was quite unusual in that House to move resolutions affecting any member of it in his presence; as all the members, he knew, were only anxious to do, in the best way they could, their duty to the House and to the Church at large without looking for any expressions of public approval. But that day and the day before they had been favoured with the results of such exhaustive labour bestowed by one member of the House upon the Education Bill and subjects intimately connected with it, that he ventured to ask their Lordships to accept a few words he had placed on paper, although they did not adequately express the deep obligations he personally felt to the member of the House whom he now had the honour of naming. The resolution was as follows :—

That this House desires to express its best thanks to the Lord Bishop of London for the great pains he has bestowed upon the Education Bill now before Parliament, and for the clear and comprehensive manner in which he has placed the whole subject before the House.

He did not think, in the presence of the Bishop, it was desirable to add more, but they all knew that the information the Bishop of London had laid before them represented a vast amount of time, trouble, and patience bestowed upon the whole subject at the various meetings of the National Society.

The Bishop of Oxford (Dr. Stubbs) seconded the motion, which was carried unanimously.

In 1892 a Clergy Discipline Act became law. Its provisions might have been regarded as interfering unduly with the privileges of the clergy, and it would not have received universal obedience if Convocation had not co-operated by passing a Canon to the effect that if a priest became legally disqualified from holding preferment by reason of crime, the Benefice might be declared vacant by the Bishop of the Diocese. In order to secure that York and Canterbury should act identically, the Bishop of London went to York and explained what the Southern Convocation was doing. The success of his mission was recognised by the following letter from Archbishop Benson :—

ADDINGTON PARK, CROYDON,
April 26, 1892.

MY DEAR BISHOP—Do you know there never was anybody like you. Your journey to York must have been a trial. But if you had not been there the Canon would have been lost, and the Church would indeed have been in a plight. . . . —Your ever affectionate and grateful,

E. W. CANTUAR.

In 1892 the Bishop also called attention to a common and erroneous interpretation of the Act of Uniformity Amendment Act of 1872, the passage of the Act he referred to being as follows :—

“So that there be not introduced into any such additional services any portion of the Order for the administration of

the Lord's Supper, or Holy Communion, or anything, except anthems or hymns, which does not form part of the Holy Scriptures or the Book of Common Prayer."

This (said the Bishop) is generally interpreted to mean that you must use in the special services, as in the additional services, the very words which are to be found in the Holy Scriptures or the Book of Common Prayer. . . . I do not think there can be any doubt at all in the mind of anybody who looks at that Act of Parliament that the real purpose was to prevent the introduction of any doctrine, or any statement of historical fact, which would be an innovation on the forms that we ordinarily use in public worship at present. . . . You could not possibly make a prayer which included a prayer for the dead, since you have not got it in the Prayer Book, unless you were able to show distinctly a passage in the Bible which contained such a prayer, or which distinctly authorised such a prayer. I mention this as showing precisely what appears to me to be the object of the Act. It was not merely to exclude heretical doctrine—this could be dealt with in another way—but it was to exclude anything which might fairly be considered an innovation upon the practice of the Church, as represented by the formularies, unless such innovations could be distinctly justified by a clear and unmistakable passage of Holy Scripture. And so, I will say again, it was intended to exclude historical statements which could not be justified by the same two authorities. . . . I do not think that under this Act it would be possible to frame such a service as that which was framed for November 5. That service would not be covered by anything, I think, contained in the Act. . . . But I do not believe in the least that there was any intention to exclude prayers where the thing is justified, although the words are not taken out of the Bible or out of the Prayer Book. . . . I will take the first Collect in the whole series—the Collect for Advent Sunday, where we pray for "grace that we may cast away the works of darkness, and put upon us the armour of light." Of course that appears in the Epistle to the Romans. The whole phrase appears there, but it does not appear there as a prayer. We go on, "Now in the time of this mortal life, in which Thy Son Jesus Christ came to visit us in great humility." There is no exact expression in the Bible which you can find to justify you in using that particular phrase, "Came to visit us in great humility," but that He did come to visit us in great

humility is distinctly and clearly set forth in the second chapter of St. Paul's Epistle to the Philippians, a chapter which justifies the use of the phrase. . . . I have no doubt whatever in my own mind that if this matter ever came before a court, and a prayer had to be judged as to its legality by the judges of the land, they would hold that a bishop was perfectly justified in understanding that such prayers as can be proved or justified substantially from the Scriptures were covered by the language of the Act. . . . For these reasons, I believe we are very much more free in the use of the power given us under this Uniformity Act Amendment Act than has been generally supposed. And I should be always prepared to advise this House when drawing up any forms of prayer to make use of that freedom, being quite sure that their action would certainly be held good by the courts of law if ever the question was argued before them. . . . What, therefore, I want this House to agree to is this :—

That it be an instruction to the Committee appointed to prepare additional forms of service that they need not consider themselves bound to use the very words of passages in the Bible or Book of Common Prayer, provided they introduce nothing which cannot substantially be found therein.

The motion was carried.

In moving the adoption of the Church Patronage Bill in 1893, he remarked :—

We shall have, no doubt, to struggle presently for our position in this country ; but, at any rate, we ought to make it perfectly clear that, when we are fighting for that position, we are not fighting for the maintenance of all those abuses which have been so very frequently the ground of attacks made upon us and of charges we think very little of, but for what touches the honour of the Church to which we belong. We desire as heartily as any of our assailants that the Church should be purely administered upon high principles, and that all abuses should be corrected as soon as they are discovered.

During this and the following year he took prominent part in the debates on the Local Government Bill, the Welsh Disestablishment Bill, Temperance Legislation, the Bill for the Union of Benefices,

the Incumbents' Resignation Acts, the proposals as to co-ordinating Ecclesiastical Fees, and the question of the Sunday Opening of Museums. Speaking of the views of the artisan class on the last-named question, he said :—

They look upon Sunday, as it now is, as practically setting them free from the obligation to labour. One of them once said to me, in talking about this matter, "What is proposed now is that you shall open the Sunday to the pleasure-lover, and you may depend upon it, that in a very short time this will mean opening Sunday to the money-lover."

Speaking, in 1895, about the financial condition of the voluntary schools, he said :—

We have already got a conscience clause on one side, but we have not got anything to correspond with it on the other. The conscience clause acts negatively. You allow the parent to say, "I will not let my child have your religious instruction," but there is very little consideration given to the claims of the parent who says, "I want my child to be instructed in the way that I like." We are constantly called upon to consider the conscience of the ratepayer. It is said over and over again, "I pay my money ; therefore I have a right to say what is to be done with it." But the consideration of the conscience of the parent who says, "I send my child, and I have a right to determine how he shall be taught," is very seldom indeed pressed, and still more seldom pressed very earnestly. For my own part, I have no hesitation in saying that I would very much rather that a child were brought up as a religious Nonconformist than that he should go without any religious instruction at all.

During his last year in London (1896) Dr. Temple moved the resolutions appended to the Report of the Joint Committee on Secondary Education with his usual ability and lucidity.

Among his duties in Convocation as premier Bishop, during these twelve years, was that of pronouncing eulogies on those members of the Upper House who were removed from it either by resignation of their Sees or by death. It was not a

task for which he was naturally inclined, but he always fulfilled it gracefully and with characteristic simplicity ; dwelling on his personal knowledge of the man, pointing out the strong traits in his nature, and delighting especially when he could declare his conviction that there had been manifest growth in capacity and development of character.

CHAPTER VIII

LONDON'S APPRECIATION OF A GREAT EPISCOPATE

Presentation of pastoral staff—Proposed disestablishment of the Church in Wales—Church endowments—The Log of the *Mayflower*—Dr. Temple as an Administrator—Confirmations—Translation to Canterbury and farewell presentations—Relations with fellow-labourers—Appendices A, B, C.

IN November, 1891, public appreciation of Dr. Temple's labours in London found fitting expression in the presentation of a pastoral staff by the clergy and laity of the diocese. The design was kindly furnished by the late Sir Arthur W. Blomfield, R.A., and carried out by Messrs. Carrington of Regent Street, much interest being taken in it by Mr. H. Hucks Gibbs, M.P. (afterwards Lord Aldenham). The staff, of silver-gilt, carried at the base of the crook the canopied figures of six Bishops of London, the intention being to illustrate the progress of St. Paul's cathedral by the names of *Mellitus* (consecrated Bishop of London by St. Augustine, 604); *Maurice* (1085), who began the cathedral destroyed in the Great Fire, which succeeded the simple structure originally set up by Mellitus; *Roger le Noir* (1229), who consecrated the choir of Old St. Paul's; and *Compton* (1674-1714), who was bishop during the whole time of the building of the present cathedral; whilst *St. Erkenwald* (674) represented "saintliness"; and *Ridley* (1500) "martyrdom."

The staff bore the inscription: "Frederico Temple S.T.P. Episcopo Londinensi, et successoribus A.S. MDCCCXCI."

The Lord Mayor presided at a largely attended meeting in the hall of Sion College, and Archdeacon Hessey, in his address to the Bishop on behalf of the Committee, said:—

Even before you came amongst us, there existed a feeling that the Diocese of London ought to have a Pastoral Staff provided for the use of its Bishop upon occasions of special interest and importance. It became gradually stronger as See after See in either province was furnished with this simple and ancient emblem of the most winning aspect of a Bishop's office—that of "a Shepherd of Souls." The deep esteem and admiration elicited by your Lordship's rule of the diocese still further quickened this feeling. . . . We offer it to you well knowing that, in the words of the late Bishop of Lincoln, you will consider it "not so much a badge of power as a monitor of duty." We offer it to you because, in your own words on a similar occasion at Exeter, you will "recognise in the fact that persons of different views have united in the gift a desire on our part that the Bishopric shall be the centre of unity and of united work."

The Bishop of London, who was warmly received, spoke with deep emotion:—

My Lord Mayor, Mr. Archdeacon, my Lords and Gentlemen, it is with no slight feeling and emotion that I accept at the hands of your Lordship the Pastoral Staff which is now presented to the diocese by so many of the clergy and laity, differing as they may in everything else, but united in their love of the Church and their desire to serve it. I accept it, not indeed as a tribute to myself, but to the office which I hold; and I accept it with still more gratitude at your hands, my Lord Mayor, because I cannot but feel that it is a most fitting thing that the Chief Magistrate of this great city should himself present to the Chief Pastor of this diocese such an emblem of affection and goodwill and regard for my office—such an emblem of the respect in which the Episcopate is held here amongst us—such an expression of that unity pervading the Church under the Government which the Lord established for it—such an emblem as I

hope will long continue to be still a symbol of the union of all kinds and sorts of men, and still express that strong feeling of the bond which unites us all, and which is the mainspring of the best of our service to our Master. What has been said so kindly of myself I cannot but feel very deeply, knowing probably better than most others can know my own shortcomings in the discharge of my duty. I cannot but deeply feel it, knowing how far I am from deserving such high eulogy as that which has been given. But I do know that my brethren, whether laymen or clergymen, are always ready to accept the hearty service of the man who, though he may make many mistakes, and sometimes be unequal to the task that is put upon him, yet at any rate can claim this—that he has an honest and strong desire to serve them, and to serve the Lord in serving them; and if, in the discharge of my duty, I have been able sometimes to encourage my brethren of the clergy in their arduous labour, if sometimes I have been able to kindle some spirit of enthusiasm where it can be used in the service of the Church, if I have been able to help any in doing his duty, gladly shall I desire to spend myself, and be spent altogether, for such a purpose as that. I desire to live for my duty, knowing that of all the things that this world can give, that which is worth all the rest is to live for duty, for love of God, for the service of men. 'This Staff', which I hold, shall be a perpetual reminder to me of the ready acceptance which I have met with from men of all sorts and in every rank, the ready acceptance with which all that I have been able to do has been constantly welcomed. It shall be a perpetual reminder to me that the clergy and laity of this great city in their kindness, in their loving appreciation of what the Bishop is able to do, have given to the See this Staff which shall be a perpetual possession, but shall also be a record of the time when I was here. I shall hold it to be something worth handing down to all that belong to me—the memory that this Staff was given to the See of London when I was Bishop of London, and that my name will stand there, as long as the Bishop shall keep this Staff, as the first bishop that ever held it. Long after I am gone away I trust that every Bishop of London will regard this Staff as a perpetual token of the true character of his office—that he is to be to the utmost of his power a Shepherd of his people.

Dr. Temple was one of the Bishops who attended

the great meeting held at the Albert Hall, in 1893, to protest against the Disestablishment of the Church in Wales. He urged that the oft-repeated argument that the Church in the Principality was in a minority there had lost its force in view of the ascertained fact that after all she was rapidly recovering ground, and already held some 40 per cent of the population. It was simply impossible to call the Welsh Church a failure, or to say that she had proved herself incapable of discharging the duties belonging to her trust. What they had to do in the matter was to see that their Master's work was better and ever better done; for, whatever other defence might be made to the various hostile arguments used against them, that would be the rock on which all defences must stand.

Dr. Temple's sympathy with the Welsh was shown by his words at the laying of the foundation-stone of the first Welsh church built in London on Paddington Green in October 1896. After the actual placing of the stone had been performed by Sir John Puleston, Constable of Carnarvon Castle, who announced that the church would be dedicated to St. David, the patron Saint of Wales, the Bishop said :—

I pray with all my heart that this church will prove a spiritual blessing to our Welsh brethren living in this part of the Metropolis. In many ways it is likely to touch the hearts, and to some extent the feelings, of all who speak the native tongue, more than ever it could be hoped to do by services in English, even when they are able to understand English and to follow the services in that tongue. But very often it happens that men who know enough English for business and domestic purposes, yet do not enter into its spirit with real devotion in the services of the Church. What, then, can be better than to give them their services in the language which appeals peculiarly to their heart, which comes from the heart, and goes to the heart? Fifty years ago, when I resided for three months in Wales, I learned

enough of Welsh to be able to follow the service, and even in a dim sort of way the sermon. But that was fifty years ago, and I have probably forgotten most of it, though not all; for although it may only be because I knew the words of the service, I could still enter into their meaning and their beauty. The Welsh people are a singularly musical people. They have in particular a remarkable power of melody, but when they sing in English the melody loses much of its charm.

As regards the question of Church Endowments, the following pronouncement may be said to have embodied the Bishop's views:—

No doubt at the time of the Reformation much that belonged to the spirituality of the nation was diverted from its purpose; but now it is proposed, not merely to take away that which resembles what was taken away at the time of the Reformation—that which, it may be said, had been abused by those who had the charge of it—but to take away even that which by unanimous confession is being used to the utmost advantage of the people, and used more and more effectively, for that advantage, day by day. If it could be stated that the Church was neglecting her duty; if it could be said that the clergy were so regardless of their high calling that it was time to displace them from their position; if it could be said that all the endowments now belonging to the Church were so entirely abused that it was impossible to defend the present use of them;—then I admit there might be some argument in favour of the proposal to take away from us all that which now is provided to enable us to do our work. But we know that this is not said, and cannot be said. I maintain—and I will maintain anywhere—that, if ever there was an institution that was doing work worthy of its position, the Church of England, especially in this Metropolis, will stand not only comparison with it, but will far outshine it in every measure by which it can be compared. I will maintain that the devotion which is shown by my clergy, in the great parishes where they often have to labour, is such as may well put to shame all those who have the oversight of them; and I myself constantly feel that, though the work that I have to do is heavy, yet I cannot stand by the side of many who are giving their lives for the service of their God, who are sacrificing their health, who

are breaking down from the pressure of their duties, and who are doing all this without any complaint, because they feel that they are called by God to do it. It is not from such an institution that money can be taken on the score that the work that it is doing is not worth the doing to the country. . . . In stating our own case it is needed that we should be perfectly clear upon one point, viz. that, if we are deprived of our position in the country, and if we are deprived of our endowments, we shall still hold that we are the Church of this country, and still maintain that we have a mission to the people of this country which we do not intend to abandon for any earthly command whatever, and which we shall with the uttermost of our power endeavour still to satisfy. It is of course quite certain that, if we are despoiled of all that which has been the great means of doing our work, we shall have to begin once more and repeat that which our forefathers did for us; we shall have to re-endow our Church, even if it cost us as many centuries to do it as it cost them, because we believe that the endowment of such religious work is for the good of the kingdom of God. . . .

Go where we will we find that the doing of God's work does require very considerable sacrifices of our substance for the purpose. We find that one of the labours which come upon all the officers of the Church is the perpetual exhortation to all men who have the wealth that they neglect not the Church's work—that in whatever use they may make of their wealth they do not forget that one great use is the advancing of the Kingdom of Christ. And, whilst we are doing this, it certainly is strange that this nation should be contemplating—as certainly very many amongst the nation are contemplating—the taking away of even what is already assigned to such purposes, and the giving of it altogether to purposes of a lower kind.¹

Referring to this utterance, the *Guardian* (April 1894) published a weighty criticism which is well worth reproducing here. Describing the Bishop's remarks as (unlike many utterances on the subject) not only forcible, but lofty and dignified in tone, it proceeds :—

¹ Upon the question as to the moral right of the State to alienate Ecclesiastical Endowments, an interesting criticism of the late Dr. Joseph Parker's position will be found in the Appendix, Note A. [See also "Primacy" Memoir, p. 315.—Ed.]

The Bishop rested his opposition to the proposals for disestablishment and disendowment on the only sufficient ground, namely, the work which the Church is now doing, and the need of her position and her endowments in order to enable her to do it. In a very striking passage he pointed to his own experience of the actual labours of the clergy and laity of the Church as evidence that the wealth devoted to their support by the piety of bygone generations is well employed. . . . We have always regretted that at the great Albert Hall demonstration last year more stress was not laid on this aspect of the question. Whether rightly or wrongly men do not in these days care much for appeals to rights and historical claims ; they are not greatly moved by declarations of the sanctity of property. Consequently, much of the ordinary language used in defence of the temporal position of the Church carries very little conviction with it. But all who are alive to the value of religious work and influence must admit that the appeal to the actual existing work accomplished by means of the endowments of the Church is one which at least deserves grave consideration ; it is not to be answered by *a priori* principles, it must be met by the proof that the purposes to which it is proposed to apply the wealth taken from the Church are better purposes, and more profitable to the national life, than those to which the organisation of the Church is at present putting it. This is a line of defence on which, as Bishop Temple's address shows, our opponents will have some difficulty, to say the least, in meeting us. . . . The real strength of the Bishop's position consists in his declaration that, come what may, the Church must rely on the system of endowments, and that if she is deprived of those she now holds "we shall have to begin once more and repeat that which our forefathers did. We shall have to re-endow our Church, even if it cost us as many centuries to do it as it cost them ; because we believe that the endowment of such religious work is for the good of the Church itself. We will not consent longer than we can possibly help that the Church should be under the power of the purse, and that the wealthy man everywhere should decide what is the kind of teaching that shall be given in the place where he resides." This is the true argument against disendowment, as many a dissenting minister can testify. . . . It is the middle classes, "the back-bone of dissent," who prefer to have their ministers under their immediate control. The working classes recognise the value

of an independent clergy. If the policy of disendowment were carried out, the Church would be at the mercy of the lay paymaster, as much as the Roman Catholic Church is in Ireland; only in England the paymaster would come from the middle class, while in Ireland he comes from the peasantry.

On September 22, 1896, only three months before Dr. Temple left Fulham, he had an important conversation with the late Senator George F. Hoar, of Massachusetts, with reference to a proposed restoration of the Bradford Manuscript, incorrectly termed the "Log of the *Mayflower*," to America. Senator Hoar was the first Vice-President of the American Antiquarian Society, and it was he who officially discovered that the document, so precious to the American people, was in the possession of the Bishop of London at Fulham Palace.

The following account of the transaction, given by Senator Hoar himself, is of great interest:—

Sunday morning (September 20) brought me a cordial letter from Mr. Grenfell, introducing me to the Bishop. I wrote a note to his Lordship, saying I should be glad to have an opportunity to see Bradford's History; that I was to sail for the United States the next Wednesday, but would be pleased to call at Fulham on Tuesday, if that were agreeable to him.

I got a note in reply, in which he said that if I would call on Tuesday he would be happy to show me "The Log of the *Mayflower*," which is the title the English, without the slightest reason in the world, give the manuscript. I kept the appointment, and found the Bishop with the book in his hand. He received me with great courtesy, showed me the palace, and said that that spot had been occupied by a Bishop's palace for more than a thousand years.

After looking at the volume and reading the records on the flyleaf, I said: "My Lord, I am going to say something which you may think rather audacious. I think this book ought to go back to Massachusetts. Nobody knows how it got over here. Some people think it was carried off by Governor Hutchinson, the Tory Governor; other people think it was carried off by British soldiers when Boston was

evacuated ; but in either case the property would not have changed. Or, if you treat it as a booty, in which last case, I suppose, by the law of nations ordinary property does change, no civilised nation in modern times applies that principle to the property of libraries and institutions of learning."

"Well," said the Bishop, "I did not know you cared anything about it."

"Why," said I, "if there were in existence in England a history of King Alfred's reign for thirty years, written by his own hand, it would not be more precious in the eyes of Englishmen than this manuscript is to us."

"Well," said he, "I think myself it ought to go back, and if it depended on me it would have gone back before this. But the Americans who have been here—many of them have been commercial people—did not seem to care much about it except as a curiosity. I suppose I ought not to give it up on my own authority. It belongs to me in my official capacity, and not as private or personal property. I think I ought to consult the Archbishop of Canterbury. And, indeed," he added, "I think I ought to speak to the Queen about it. We should not do such a thing behind her Majesty's back."

I said, "Very well. When I go home I will have a proper application made from some of our literary societies, and ask you to give it consideration."

I saw Mr. Bayard and told him the story. He was at the train when I left London for the steamer at Southampton. He entered with great interest into the matter, and told me he would gladly do anything in his power to forward it.

When I got home I communicated with Secretary Olney about it, who took a kindly interest in the matter, and wrote to Mr. Bayard that the Administration desired he should do everything in his power to promote the application. The matter was then brought to the attention of the Council of the American Antiquarian Society, the Massachusetts Historical Society, the Pilgrim Society of Plymouth, and the New England Society of New York. These bodies appointed committees to unite in the application. Governor Wolcott was also consulted, who gave his hearty approbation to the movement, and a letter was despatched through Mr. Bayard.

Meantime Bishop Temple, with whom I had my conversation, had himself become Archbishop of Canterbury, and in that capacity Primate of all England. His successor, the Right Rev. Dr. Creighton, had been the delegate of

John Havard's College (Emmanuel, Cambridge), to the great celebration at Harvard University in 1886, on the two hundred and fiftieth anniversary of its foundation. He had received the degree of Doctor of Laws from the University, had been a guest of President Eliot, and had received President Eliot as his guest in England.

He was an accomplished historical scholar, and very friendly in sentiment to the people of the United States. So, by great good fortune, the two eminent ecclesiastical personages who were to have a powerful influence in the matter were exceedingly well disposed.

In due course the manuscript was handed over to the American Ambassador, the Hon. Thomas F. Bayard, at London House on May 29, 1897; judgment favourable to its restoration having been pronounced in the Consistory Court of London by the Chancellor of the Diocese, Dr. Tristram.

The following address, illuminated on parchment, was sent to Dr. Temple and to Dr. Creighton:—

The Society of the *Mayflower* descendants in the State of New York has learned with much pleasure of the generous act of the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishop of London in restoring to America "the manuscript of the Plymouth Plantation containing an account of the voyage of the *Mayflower*, written by William Bradford, one of the founders and second Governor," and in recognition of it has unanimously adopted the following resolutions:—Resolved, that this Society gratefully acknowledges the obligation conferred by the Archbishop of Canterbury and Bishop of London on the American people, and particularly the Historical and Genealogical Societies of the United States, by the return to America of Bradford's Manuscript History of the Plymouth Colony, and begs to express its appreciation of the generous and disinterested spirit which has prompted the return of so precious a relic, an action which will tend to increase the friendship of the two nations. Resolved, that copies of this resolution be sent to the Archbishop of Canterbury and Bishop of London.

NEW YORK,
April 7, 1897.

(Sgd.) HENRY E. HOWLANCE (Governor).
FREDERIC H. HATCH (Secretary).

Seal.

The following letter from Dr. Temple forms a fitting close to this memorable incident :—

LAMBETH PALACE, S.E.,
June 11, 1897.

MY DEAR SIR—I am indeed most gratified for the kindness you have shown in sending the account of the proceedings at the reception of the Bradford Manuscript by the Governor of Massachusetts. And the words used at that reception by yourself and by the other speakers will long burn in many English hearts as expressing the warm feelings which so many Americans cherish toward the Mother Country. Be assured that the strong respect and affection which is felt in England towards the Great Republic of the West, our pride in your greatness, and desire for your good will, although they may wax and wane as human things inevitably do, yet will never perish. I pray God to bless the deep-felt sympathy that links our hearts to yours, and binds us closer together than any other two nations ever were or ever will be bound.—Believe me, yours very sincerely,

F. CANTUAR.

The Honourable G. F. Hoar.

I was fortunate (writes Senator Hoar) in having formed the friendship of Mr. Grenfell, which secured to me so cordial a reception from the Bishop of London.

It was fortunate that the Bishop of London was Dr. Temple, an eminent scholar, kindly disposed toward the people of the United States, and a man thoroughly capable of understanding and respecting the deep and holy sentiment which a compliance with our desire was to gratify.

It was fortunate, too, that Bishop Temple, who thought he must have the approbation of the Archbishop before his action, when the time came had himself become Archbishop of Canterbury and Primate of all England.

It was fortunate that Dr. Creighton should have succeeded him to the See of London.

During the whole period of his London Episcopate, the Bishop was a tower of strength as an Ecclesiastical Commissioner and a governor of Queen Anne's Bounty ; his business habits, his shrewd common-sense, and his quiet perception of the crucial point in every question, all combining

to make a wise administrator and an ideal chairman.

Throughout his Primacy, Archbishop Benson—and it is no slur on his memory to mention the fact—looked to Dr. Temple as his adviser and chief lieutenant.¹ Indeed it was an open secret that many a letter from many an Episcopal palace found its way to Fulham, and that decisions which have influenced the whole Church were not issued without the careful revision of the strongest mind upon the Episcopal Bench. But, notwithstanding his commanding influence in the Church, he did not, as Bishop of London, attain a corresponding position in the House of Lords—a fact which Archbishop Benson regretted in the following oft-quoted passages of his diary (1891) :—

It is painful, very painful to see the Lords always so unappreciative of the Bishop of London—the strongest man nearly in the House, the clearest, the highest toned, the most deeply sympathetic, the clearest in principle—yet because his voice is a little harsh, and his accent a little provincial (though of what province it is hard to say), and his figure square and his hair a little rough, and because all this sets off the idea of his independence, he is not listened to at all by these cold, kindly, worldly wise, gallant land-owning powers. Some day his force and goodness *must* carry them. . . . There is something sickening in seeing the House of Lords with its regulated tones and silken manners, which are well able to express as much contempt and animosity and selfishness, as they are able to express if they choose kindness and sympathy and chivalry, utterly unaware that they have greatness and strength in the Bishop of London. They talk, they look, they laugh at any allowance against himself which he makes. But I cannot but believe that if he would only speak a little oftener he must impress even their complacencies.

It is only fair, however, to add that all this was

¹ See also “Exeter” Memoir, vol. i. pp. 592-593; and “Primacy” Memoir, pp. 247-249.—*Ed.*

changed when he became Archbishop, and that the peers learnt to appreciate—as others had before them—not only the weighty speech, but the speaker himself and even the manner of his speaking.

Difficult it is to imagine how any one with the smallest sensibility to impressions of strength and dignity could look with indifference—still less with any unworthier feeling—upon the noble face and expression which Professor Herkomer has depicted on the canvas which was painted as a presentation portrait for Fulham Palace early in 1896—only a few months before the translation to Canterbury. A replica was painted for Mrs. Temple, both gifts being subscribed for by the clergy and laity of the diocese.

It is the portrait of a man whose life offered to an age of growing and abounding luxury “the spectacle of sheer unadorned force, of a virtue bare and (as it were) desolate as Sinai”—a life to which it is “good to know that the world will even now submit.”

One of the best photographs of the Bishop was taken under critical circumstances by his elder son. The episcopal study was usually free to the family, but there were certain times and seasons when interruptions were not permitted on any pretext. The young photographer determined to secure a snapshot that should catch a characteristic expression; so, having secretly erected his camera in the room and duly focussed it, he tapped at the door during forbidden hours. “Who’s there?” exclaimed the Bishop. “I am, father.” “You can’t come in.” “But I want to see you.” “Go away at once; you know the rule!” Then the door was suddenly opened, and click went the “shutter” before the indignant sire could grasp the situation. The facial expression can be imagined.

In truth the massive head and strong features easily lent themselves to photographic reproduction, and their pose was always impressive. Some years afterwards an artist who was photographing a royal group exclaimed, "I must ask your Grace not to hold up your head so high." "Quite right," laughed an illustrious personage who was present, "he must not be a proud prelate." Dr. Temple's outward bearing and presence, which were a true index of his noble personality, impressed all with whom he came in contact, and none more so than that excellent judge of men, the German Emperor—to whom he was introduced by Sir Frank Lascelles. The appreciation was mutual.

A word must be said, in closing, about the Bishop's Confirmation addresses.¹ "They live in my memory," writes Dr. Welldon, in reference to Harrow Confirmations, "when I think of him; for they were impressive from their strength and manliness (though in truth rather long), and the note of reality was dominant in them all." No one who heard them ever forgot the power with which he dealt with his favourite themes—the work of the Holy Spirit, the functions of the conscience, the law of Christian duty, and the personal attraction of Christ. A little pamphlet of notes of one of his addresses on "The Christian Battle" has been published² by an old friend, Miss F. Arnold-Forster, and will be read with affectionate interest, perhaps, by some upon whose heads his hands were laid in blessing.

Those who heard him speak of *Christian Duty* will call to mind his stirring warning against the endeavour to serve two masters. He was wont to urge upon candidates the impossibility of their service being what it ought to be, unless they had

¹ See also "Exeter" Memoir, vol. i. pp. 316, 317 and 586, 587.—Ed.

² S.P.C.K.

indeed given themselves wholly to God. There ought to be at least the consecration of the will and the purpose to God. If a man failed, it ought to be because he had slipped, and not because he had failed in his intention to be the Saviour's servant and God's child. One of the most marked forms of imperfect consecration was cowardice. They saw, sometimes, a man who really meant to serve God, and yet for all that was too much of a coward to speak, or to act, when he ought to do so. If a young man or young woman heard language used dishonouring to God, it was their plainest duty to let it be seen that they did not partake in it.

Nothing annoyed Dr. Temple more—though in this he was not singular among bishops—than the fussing of officials, lay or clerical, at Confirmations. The vicar or curate who made himself over active or prominent in his efforts to marshal the candidates was pretty certain to be beckoned and curtly reprimanded in two words—"Don't fidget!"

We can vouch for the accuracy of a very pretty anecdote¹ which illustrates the Bishop's tenderness, a tenderness for which the casual observer gave him little credit. There were two crippled boys in an institution; they were scarcely of an age to be confirmed, but they were separated from the outward temptations of the world and were not likely to live very many months. It was thought that they might become communicants, and the Bishop's sanction was sought that they might be admitted to Communion as being "ready and willing to be confirmed" though unable to leave their beds to attend a Confirmation. But the Bishop, instead of sanctioning this, immediately replied, "I will come and see them, and if I find them fit I will confirm them." He came on the appointed day and spoke very gently and sweetly to the boys.

¹ Communicated by the late Prebendary Whitworth.

But to one question which he put he received a most startling answer, couched in decidedly Roman phraseology. The Bishop was somewhat astonished, and turning to the parish priest, who was standing by, he said, "I think you had better see to their having a little more instruction, and in a fortnight I will come again." And so he did, and confirmed the lads, who were about nine years old. On the question of age for confirmation Bishop Temple took a very different position from his predecessor. Bishop Jackson liked the candidates to be at least in their fifteenth year, but Bishop Temple said, "I was confirmed myself at twelve,¹ and I have never thought that I was confirmed too early."

Archbishop Benson died at Hawarden on Sunday, October 11, 1896. The news reached London in time for reference to be made to it from various pulpits that afternoon and evening, but it did not reach Fulham until next morning. The Bishop was profoundly moved, and acquainted his chaplain with the fact on his way to service in the chapel. As soon as he had knelt in prayer he burst out sobbing, and it was several moments before his sobbing ceased. None of those who were in the chapel will ever forget the scene, or the wonderful self-control with which the Bishop rose from his knees and read aloud the solemn words of the fifteenth chapter of the First Epistle to the Corinthians.

The two men had loved each other and worked together like brothers for many, many years; and the survivor must have felt a terrible sense of desolation as he stood upon the battlefield alone. Already he had fought a good fight,¹ but not yet had he finished his course. He was now to succeed, at the age of seventy-five, to the supreme command of the army of Christ's Church in these realms.

¹ "Earlier Years" Memoir, vol. i. p. 30.—Ed.

A telegram from Lord Salisbury, which reached Fulham Palace shortly after 11 o'clock on Sunday morning, October 25, 1896, was the first intimation received in London of the elevation of Dr. Temple to the vacant Archbishopric of Canterbury. He was then occupied in preaching to a crowded congregation at Christ Church, Woburn Square. In the evening he was present at the Parish Church of All Saints, Fulham, when the vicar, the Rev. Canon Muriel, who had had private information of the appointment, congratulated the new Primate. "My Lord," he said, "I hardly know what to say on this great occasion." The answer was quite to the point. "You may not know what to say, but you at least know what to do."

At St. Paul's Cathedral, on the Sunday after the appointment, Prebendary Kempe, speaking, he said, as the senior of the Cathedral Staff, and one who had worked in London under four bishops, expressed his persuasion that no appointment to the Primacy could be made or desired better than that of Bishop Temple. If justification of his claims were required, it could be met in the very words of the epitaph suggested for the architect of the Cathedral, *Si monumentum requiris, circumspice*. From the gallery under that cross which crowns the dome there could be seen everywhere parishes in unbroken contiguity that would illustrate the great and successful labours of Bishop Temple, and prove him to have been a workman eminently worthy of his reward.

Most of the papers, while admitting that the appointment would come as a complete surprise to the country, were unanimous in declaring that, had the Bishop been twenty or even ten years younger, it would have been the most natural thing in the world.

The comments of the *Morning Post* are worth reproducing :—

Under his wise and prudent rule the Church in the Metropolis has advanced by leaps and bounds. The history of Church work in London, since Dr. Temple entered upon the diocese, has scarcely a parallel in the history of Christianity during the nineteenth century. On every side light has been carried into darkness, new churches have risen in unexampled numbers, means have been found to provide every parish with an adequate staff of clergy, and to the poor the Gospel has been preached. With his own clergy, of whatever school of thought, the Bishop has succeeded in maintaining the best possible relations, and there are none to whom his removal to Canterbury will not be a source of genuine regret for themselves, and of rejoicing for the Church at large. In both the episcopates which he has filled the new Primate has shown that he possesses the gift of real statesmanship, and it is this quality which, above all others, will encourage Churchmen to hope that if his primacy may not be long in point of time, it will be worthy of the traditions of the past.

At the Hackney Ruridecanal Conference, a few days afterwards, the Bishop replied to a vote of congratulation that there were some services which he felt he could still render to the Church, and that he was not therefore justified in refusing the Primacy. At his age he could not expect to be spared much longer. The office called for less physical labour and less bodily strain than did the Bishopric of London; but the correspondence was enormous, even greater than in London. The extent of the calls for advice from the Church in the Colonies was growing daily; but sometimes the body began to wear out while the mind was still unimpaired, and, as the physical labour of the office would be less oppressive than in the Diocese of London, he did not feel justified in saying no, or in deliberating very long.

The public farewell of Bishop Temple to his clergy took place on Wednesday, December 23, 1896, the function consisting of a plain celebration of the Holy Communion in St. Paul's

Cathedral, with sermon by the Bishop. The service was almost unique in character. The Bishop's words were strong and vigorous, and his whole demeanour gave little sign of any failure of power, such as many were ready to assign to his seventy-five years. He did not attempt in any way to review the history of his Episcopate, save that he spoke with much feeling of the devotion of his clergy, and of the many lessons which he himself had learnt from them during the last eleven years. Through all his words there ran an undercurrent of thought, such as is suggested by the Feast of All Saints. The blessed influence which men of high character cannot help exerting upon those who associate with them was appropriately and feelingly emphasised. It was a great sermon worthy of a great occasion.

The Bishop selected as his text Colossians ii. 5: "For though I be absent in the flesh, yet am I with you in the spirit, joying in beholding your order, and the steadfastness of your faith in Christ." The closing passages of the sermon were as follows:—

Such is the communion of saints which binds all Christians together, which makes us at all times one, one with another, uniting us under one Supreme Head, the Lord Jesus Himself. Such is the tie, never to be broken, which binds men who love the Lord, and who try honestly to serve Him "in one communion and fellowship, in the mystical Body of Christ Himself"; and, whilst that bond exists, there is no parting that really separates the servants of the Lord. One may be called to work here, and another may be called to work there, and another may be called away to the other world, where the command of God is plainer, and is more sure to be observed; but all alike still are bound in one; and, though they part, so far as they know each other at all their knowledge will be perpetually consecrated by the recollection that they are within the reach of that grand common life which is the Lord's gift to the Church that He has created.

And so on this occasion—to speak of myself and of you—we

part; and yet I shall carry with me the recollection of all the great work that is being done by the clergy of this diocese. I shall carry with me the many lessons that I have learnt from seeing their labour, from entering into discussions on various and most important questions affecting our duties. I shall keep as a lasting possession all that I have learnt from my fellow-ministers in the Gospel—my brethren—here, who have taught me so much, perhaps without themselves always being aware of it; of whom I will say that I do not believe that on the face of the whole earth there is to be found a body of ministers of the Gospel that can surpass them in the steadfastness of their faith, or in the earnestness of their devotion. We part; but I, for the rest of my days, shall still have in my soul the traces of the life that I have lived here amongst you, and with you; and I shall carry with me, in the new work that I have to do, the thought of all that wonderful kindness with which I have always been received amongst you here, and the thought of all that wonderful devotion that I have witnessed in your labours. I shall carry with me the hope that I too in my turn may in some degree be remembered by those whom I have had so much reason to thank, and in so great a degree regard with affection; though I know full well that no affection is due from you to me, such as that which is due from me to you. I pray that the Lord, who has knit our hearts together, will to the end still make us feel the marvellous bond which unites all Christians, and, whilst uniting all Christians, always unites still more closely those who have laboured together in His service.

The Bishop, who evidently felt very deeply the farewell he was officially taking of his clergy, was much affected when delivering the closing words.

Subsequently an interesting presentation was made at the Chapter House to Mrs. Temple, who, with her two sons, had been present at the service. The presentation was from the ladies of the diocese, and was made by Miss Gregory, daughter of the Dean of St. Paul's. It consisted of a Chippendale bookcase, writing bureau and chair, with silver fittings for the writing-table, and also a cheque for £50 to be expended on some personal object, or

given to a charity, as Mrs. Temple might see fit. The Bishop was much moved by the recognition of Mrs. Temple's work, and, in speaking of her, said : "She is well worthy of anything that can be given her, or of any honour that can be paid to her. I ought to know, for we have lived together twenty years, and I think her the one woman in the world."

An offering of the members of the Ladies Diocesan Association had been previously made to Mrs. Temple on Saturday, December 12, at Carlton House Terrace. The amount collected was £127:2s. Lady Frederick Cavendish, in presenting the offering, explained that the ladies of the Association were not making a personal gift. In accordance with what they believed would be her wish, they had collected the money as an acknowledgment of the great services which Mrs. Temple had rendered to the Association, and placed it now in her hands to be distributed, as she should think fit, among the institutions of the diocese in which she took special interest. Lady Frederick Cavendish dwelt upon the kindness of Mrs. Temple to all the members of the Association, and then placed in her hands a cheque for the amount collected, with a list of the names of the subscribers.

The farewell of Dr. Temple to the Diocese of London at the Guildhall on Monday, January 18, was a fitting conclusion to a great episcopate. The first intention was to have held the meeting in the Church House. That would doubtless have been an appropriate place ; but it was an inspiration to him who first thought of holding it in the Guildhall, and every one present on the occasion must have felt that the associations of the City gave to the Bishop's farewell an interest that no other place could have given.

The Lord Mayor and Corporation attended in

state. The Lord Mayor (Alderman Sir J. Faudel-Phillips) took the chair at three o'clock. On the platform with him were members of the Corporation, representatives of Church Societies, and men of rank distinguished for their eminence in Church and State—still more for the interest and share they took in works of benevolence. The body of the great hall was crowded, at least 1500 persons being present.

The Lord Mayor opened the proceedings in a short but well-conceived speech. He touched the hearts of his hearers when he preferred to say "Addio" rather than "Vale," because "while they were there to deplore a great loss on account of the Bishop's removal from their midst, yet their loss was a national gain, and therefore they must hide their lighter sorrow under their greater rejoicing." Cheers greeted his remark that "they would miss the transcendent labours which he had successfully rendered, and which had not only been of great aid and service to them, but a noble and all-absorbing example." He concluded by saying that he stood before them as the Chief Magistrate of the City, empowered to address the meeting in the name of the citizens at large.

Mr. F. A. Bevan then presented to Mrs. Temple a replica of her husband's portrait by Professor Herkomer.

The Dean of St. Paul's presented to the Archbishop the seals for the Diocese of Canterbury as a gift from the office-bearers of the Diocese of London.

The Archdeacons of London and Middlesex presented an address signed by nearly all the clergy, and artistically bound in vellum. The address was headed, "To the Right Hon. and Most Rev. Frederick Temple, D.D., eleven years Bishop of London, Archbishop of Canterbury,

Primate of all England: The Bishops Suffragan, Archdeacons, Presbyters, and Deacons of the Diocese of London send greeting in the Lord." The address closed with the words: "That His mercy and grace may be abundantly poured upon you, and that His spirit may rest on you in all the fulness of His gifts is our heartfelt prayer."

Addresses were afterwards presented from various Diocesan Societies and from the Welsh Churches. Amongst them from:

Bishop of London's Fund.

East London Church Fund.

London Diocesan Home Mission.

London Diocesan Lay Helpers' Association.

London Diocesan Branch, Church of England Temperance

London Diocesan Church Reading Union.

London Diocesan Council, Welfare of Young Men.

London Diocesan Council, Preventive and Rescue Work.

London Branch Sunday School Institute.

Metropolitan Visiting and Relief Association.

Parochial Mission Women Association.

Welsh Churches in London.

Homes for Inebriates.

Society for the Study of Inebriates.

Church Sanitary Association.

Hostel of St. Luke.

The Archbishop was received with loud and prolonged cheering, the entire audience standing as he rose. He said:—

My Lord Mayor, it is with mingled feelings that you have said you come here to-day to join so many of the people of this diocese in bidding me farewell, and I can assure you it is with mingled feelings that I respond to your kindness. I have worked here for eleven years, and I have worked here consequently long enough to be able to appreciate the way in which the Diocese of London, and, above all, the City of London, receives any man who is willing to devote himself to his duty among them. I

have tried honestly to do my duty to the best of my ability, and it is a wonderful encouragement to be appreciated as I have been, and as I am visibly this day. I know very well—no man can fail to know in such circumstances—that your responsive kindness very far overpasses the obligations under which you lie to me. I know very well that it is your kindness which makes so much of all that I have done. It is your kindness that uses such language as has been used to me this afternoon, and I suppose that any man who receives such kind words will be quite sure to feel somewhat humiliated at the thought that he has not really deserved them, and that it is the kindness of those who utter and of those who write which fills all that has been said and all the addresses that have been presented with such words of high estimation as have been used to me this afternoon. I know that very well. But whatever I may know, I know too that ever since I have been in the diocese I have always met with the same kind of hearty encouragement. I have always found that a real attempt to do a man's duty, wherever else it may fail of being met with cordial appreciation, never fails to meet it in this diocese and in this great City. The portrait which Mrs. Temple is so glad to receive at your hands, while it will always remind her of the services of her husband in this diocese and of the way in which those services have been received, will also still more remind her of the kindness of heart which has prompted that mode of recognition of all that she herself has done to promote whatever work the Bishop of London was engaged in. I feel, too, the warmth of that kindliness which has presented me with the seals of my new diocese; and all the addresses that have followed one after another have spoken to me of kind hearts that I am very sorry indeed to leave, for in all this work I have grown to love the place, to love the work, and, above all, to love the people. I do not know whether it would be possible anywhere else in the world to find such invariable, such strong and warm response to anything that a man could do. The work, no doubt, has been laborious—and a man with ten times my power of labour would still find that the work demanded all his power—but it has always been sweetened by the sense that it was valued. Of course, like other men, I have made mistakes now and then, but no man could find his mistakes passed over so kindly as I have found any mistakes I have made passed over in this diocese where I have lived and laboured. I

have endeavoured, as far as I possibly could, always to uphold the rule of strict justice in all my administration, and there, too, I cannot pretend that I have always been successful. I do not know of any instance in which I have failed, but to administer justice is always exceedingly difficult, and it may be sometimes quite impossible; and if in any respect I have failed there, it has been from human infirmity, and not from the lack of endeavour to be absolutely just. I can, at any rate, fearlessly plead that in the work of the diocese I have never thought of myself, of my own inclinations, of any prepossessions of my own, or of anything but what presented itself to my conscience as the plain rule of duty. I can fearlessly assert that if you have judged me by the motives from which my conduct has sprung, you have not in any degree over-estimated the strong desire that I have always felt to do what was right in itself, as far as I could ascertain it. I am going now to other work over a larger sphere. I am going to work which will not bring me into so immediate a contact with a great city like this. I am going to work with very many more men, no doubt, but not at quite such close quarters with any great body such as I have been dealing with for the last eleven years. If I can make anything like the same impression upon those with whom I have to deal hereafter, then, indeed, I shall feel that the work that I have done here among you has been a fitting training for the work which I am now undertaking; and through my life, which cannot now be very much longer, I shall always look back to my holding of the Diocese of London as the special time when my education may be said to have been completed. Although I was rather old when I came here, I have learned quite as much in the Diocese of London as I ever learned in any other place or in any other office I have held in the whole course of my life. I feel that I am so far stronger and better fitted for the work I am going to do because of the work I have been able to do here, and because of the lessons I have perpetually learned from all those whom I have met here. I leave you with real sorrow at the parting; I leave you with real gratitude for your kindness; and as long as I live I shall certainly feel through my very heart how the clergy always received me here, and how the great body of the laity were willing to overlook whatever errors I may have made, and to give a generous construction to everything that I have done. My Lord Mayor, I have ceased to be Bishop of London, but will you allow me to

say that of all those who have done work in the Diocese of London while I have been here I have always found the greatest satisfaction in the result where the Lord Mayor has been willing to co-operate with me? The Chief Magistrate of this City will always, in my estimation, rank very high indeed amongst those who are of real value to the whole country, and in their turn to the Church of Christ to which we belong. I trust that the Mayor of this place, holding so high an office as he does, will always do such kindness to all good works as the Mayors have hitherto done, and, as I can testify to, done with marvellous perseverance and with wonderful success. My friends of this diocese, wherever you are, and whoever you are, and whatever place you hold, you will be in my heart all the time that I am with you; and although it will not be my duty to see as much of you in future as I have lately done, you may be certain that I shall remember you and look back with gratitude upon your kindness as long as I still remain on earth.

So closed right worthily a memorable episcopate of twelve years (January 30, 1885, to December 23, 1896). We have reviewed Dr. Temple's public work as Bishop of London; we have illustrated the kindly and even cordial intercourse he maintained with the clergy and laity of the diocese, who had come to feel that his rough manner was but skin-deep, that the warmth was there and the love was there, though neither lay upon the surface. It remains only to speak of his closer and more affectionate relations with those who shared his labours in the administration of diocesan affairs.

His generous treatment of all who worked with him never failed at any crisis, as all his subordinates can testify. Did a domestic chaplain make a stupid or careless mistake that caused widespread inconvenience, the Bishop always insisted on bearing the blame. When one of them wished to make an explanation through the Press that the error lay with him, the reply was, "My dear fellow, my back is broader than yours." On another occasion he said to another who was regretting

some mistake as an inexcusable offence, "If you think you are never going to make blunders we shall never get on with each other." The Bishop of Bristol (Dr. Forrest Browne) gives a striking example of his loyalty in upholding the authority of his suffragans.

When I was Bishop of Stepney I found that, in a certain parish where I was about to take a Confirmation, several candidates had been rejected on the ground that they would not go to confession. The rite was at once postponed *sine die* by telegram, and the Bishop of London informed of the reason. The Bishop decided that the Incumbent should be required to sign a formal undertaking that no such obligation should in future be imposed upon candidates from the parish in question, and the document was eventually signed. Shortly afterwards I received the following telegram from him, which had been despatched from a church where he was that morning holding a Confirmation:—"Candidates presented here by X—— from St. —— parish; shall not confirm them *without your written permission*."

There was a doubt among his examining chaplains as to whether they would still have the privilege of attending him on the day of his enthronement at Canterbury, or whether he would by that time have exchanged them for the chaplains of the late Archbishop. The point was submitted to him one morning at breakfast during the Advent Ember week at Fulham, and he replied in affectionate tones that meant more than the words, "You are mine until the enthronement has taken place,"—adding, with a twinkle in his eye, "When the peacock goes forth in all his glory you will be feathers in his tail." Similarly, on the day when he bade farewell to the clergy of the Diocese at St. Paul's, and was received by the Dean and Chapter at the west door of the Cathedral, he slowly unwound, on entering, the well-known grey woollen throat-protector that he invariably wore, saying

with a smile as he turned to the writer of this memoir, "You will carry the sacred scarf to-day!"

The following tribute from his old friend and suffragan, Dr. Alfred Earle, Bishop of Marlborough, now Dean of Exeter, sums up several of the personal qualities that left their impress upon his work in London :—

He never attempted brilliancy, but thoroughness; he thought more of conscience than genius, more of great futures than little results; he was deaf to the praise or blame of the world. He was the only man to whom I could ever say *Rabboni*, the only master I ever worked under who was different from all others in the absolute absence of anything approaching to vanity, self-seeking, show, or littleness; a man of very deep spiritual life and constant prayer. . . . I never heard him say an unkind thing of any one. I never heard him say a thing I could have wished unsaid. I never heard him—and for a long while we were very closely associated—speak of himself or his work. "I" and "my" were words almost absent from his conversation. He never fretted; he never worried. I never knew him in a hurry or late. He seldom kept one waiting. He might be hard at work in the middle of an important sentence of a grave report, but it was always the same; the bright, grave, loving uplook straight into one's eyes, and the "Well, what does the Bishop of Marlborough want?" and wholly, thoroughly, he would take in all I had to tell. . . . He was merciful to blunderers and used to say, "I make plenty of blunders, but nobody seems to find them out. Every hard worker makes many more mistakes than the world supposes." His thoroughness was as absolute as his unselfishness. He never did a thing to get it done—as so many others do. All that he did was viewed and reviewed in its probable relation to final results. This made him sometimes slow, but I think that most of his rivets will stand. . . . Archdeacon Hessey once said to me, "I am usually a bit anxious when I take a report to Temple; he always goes a spit underneath me. Last week I took him one over which I had spent weeks, and which in my judgment was absolutely conclusive and exhaustive. He warmly thanked me and praised my work, 'but,' he said, 'have you not missed out so and so?' and down he went his usual spade's

depth below me. This is always so. His thoroughness amazes me."

The present Bishop of London bears witness to another characteristic closely allied to the one just noticed.

When I was Head of Oxford House, he offered me the living of St. Matthew's, Bethnal Green. I went to see him, and told him that I was advised by many friends that the responsibilities and labours of a parish of ten thousand souls, in addition to the work of the Oxford House, might seriously injure my health and strength. "Oh, but we don't think of that, do we?" was his reply. *He* certainly never thought of it; and it was plain enough to all who knew him that the long strain of his twelve years in London was on the point of breaking him down when the respite came in the call to Canterbury.

Severe where he found idleness, and severer still where he detected insincerity, he was nevertheless no pessimist, no martinet, no hard critic of men.

His was a Gospel of *Work* of a far higher and healthier order than Carlyle's.

All he did was full of hope and faith, and beneath his rugged exterior there ever burned the fires of a noble love for man and for God.

If it be asked what were the positive results of his London Episcopate, the answer is, clearly, that he stirred the diocese from end to end; that he made both clergy and laity feel, in every parish, that "to work was to pray"; that he created an enthusiasm for the temperance cause and for foreign missions such as had never been known before; that he made the value of religious education understood among all classes of the community; and, to crown all, that he left behind him, as his permanent legacy to the See of London, the memory of a grand moral and spiritual personality which, in the living power of the communion

of saints, must remain with the Church he loved to the end of time, as "the shadow of a great rock in a weary land."¹

¹ See *infra*, note on p. 387.—ED.

THE NEW PRIMATE

Age as of granite, with a heart of fire :
Nerve as of iron, strength that cannot tire :
Hard on himself, to others bluff and bold,
The great dear master that we loved of old !
Now with a gesture strong, and massive phrase,
Like to a boulder of primæval days,
Unpolished, rude, the ponderous sentence rolls,
To lie unmoved, a landmark in our souls,
Low in the valley, telling whence it came,
The winter's ravage on the rocks of flame !

Such is his common talk : on themes more high
He softens, melts ; a tear is in his eye ;
Till as it falls, and wets his rugged cheek,
His voice grows stern ; you shall not think him weak,
But with himself at war ; the only foe
He dreads, the fire that throbs too fierce below.

Only at times, of Christmas, Easter-day,
He breaks all bounds, he casts the curb away ;
Flings off restraint, and counting not the cost,
Fights for his Lord, a soldier at his post ;
His Master, as he calls Him : tremblingly
The word falls from him with a yearning cry.

Then, as they hear, the idlers, old and young,
Arrested stop, and from an old man's tongue,
Catching his fire, forget their dreary cries
Of languor born, their cobweb sophistries,
Kindle and glow ; and, as the trumpet rings,
Drink deep, athirst, his rage for better things ;
Gird up their feeble loins, and, self forgot,
Find a new pastime in the toiler's lot ;
And in the touch of hearts an inborn spell
To bring back Christ on earth, in hearts to dwell.

Such is his power. O Thou, that guidest all
Grant him to give, and us to hear, the call,
The leader's rallying signal ; and through lands
Of sea-spread England knit concordant bands :

At home a steadfast strength, a dauntless power
Wisely to stem the madness of the hour :
With justice, as the light transparent, free,
And patience like a slowly-sapping sea,
Preaching to wayward hearts too fain to roam,
Brotherhood, union, purity, and home.

A. G. B.

From *The Spectator*.

APPENDIX A

THE PROPOSED GRESHAM UNIVERSITY

The Bishop of London addressed the following letter to the Lord Mayor on the subject of the proposed Gresham University :—

FULHAM PALACE,
February 13, 1892.

MY DEAR LORD MAYOR—I desire to express my gratitude to you, and others who have acted with you, for the part that you have lately taken in the proposal to unite the London Colleges, King's and University, with the old Gresham foundation, and thus form what is certain to become a great teaching University for the City and for the whole Metropolis. The Gresham University, besides having the advantage of a well-known and honoured name, will at once possess a central position of great dignity, and several excellent professorships which have done good work in times gone by, and will have openings for doing still better work in times to come. On the other hand, King's College and University College will become for the first time constituent parts of an institution similar in character to the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, capable both of supplying the highest kind of literary and scientific teaching, and also of certifying the results by granting degrees to its own students.

The University of London does excellent work in examining all comers and appraising their attainments. But the highest kind of teaching, which aims at formation of mind, cannot find free play for itself under a system which subordinates the teacher to the examiner. Such a system has a perpetual tendency to give a mechanical character both to the teaching and to its results. Originality

and freshness in the teaching is killed by the perpetual necessity of paying regard, not to the subject that is to be taught, but to the examination that is to be passed.

The business of the Gresham University will be to gradually combine all the higher teaching given by the various agencies now at work in London and to bring them into harmonious relations with one another as rapidly as their own consent can be obtained and their constitutions have been settled.

An institution, to be a constituent part of a University, must have a definite aim, a legal position, a formed constitution, and must be prepared to carry its instruction to the University level. It would be out of place to admit a mere school for boys on the one hand, or a mere series of classes on the other. But there is a great deal doing in London at present which will rapidly find its place in the new University when once that University shall have been formed and set to work.

The two colleges and the Gresham foundation are the right nucleus of the new institution. The Gresham professorships exist for the very purpose of giving the kind of instruction wanted, and, had they been early incorporated into a body that could grant degrees, would undoubtedly now be holding a much more conspicuous place than they do. The colleges are engaged in the actual work, and they have never yet been able to show their true merit because they have steadily refused to lower their instruction by making the passing of an examination the one purpose of its being given.

I have no doubt that the Gresham University will steadily and rapidly become a living educational power of high value. It will gather round it traditions and characteristics of its own, will inspire its students with enthusiasm for studies of the highest kind, will adapt all that is most excellent in existing systems to the needs of London, and will make its degrees rank everywhere with those that rank highest.

I hope that nothing will induce you or your friends to hesitate in carrying forward what you have begun. The objections that you have to deal with are utterly without substance, and the opposition that you may encounter will be made by those who will one day rejoice that you disregarded them. I am, my Lord Mayor, your obedient servant,

F. LONDON :

The Right Honourable the Lord Mayor.

APPENDIX B

THE GRESHAM UNIVERSITY CHARTER

TO THE EDITOR OF "THE TIMES"

SIR—With the consent of the Bishop of London, I beg to forward to you the accompanying correspondence. I propose shortly, with your permission, to address you on the subject of denominational colleges, a question which is largely and widely misunderstood. Yours obediently,

CHARLES S. ROUNDELL.

February 23, 1892.

16 CURZON STREET, MAYFAIR,
February 17, 1892.

MY DEAR BISHOP—The great authority which you possess in all educational matters gives weight to the statement in your letter to the Lord Mayor, that "the objections which he has to deal with," in regard to the Albert University, "are utterly without substance."

So many persons, however, hold these objections irrespective of party, and unconnected with existing institutions, either in London or the provinces, that I venture to put them before you in summary form.

Under the proposed Charter this teaching University will be without University teachers. That of itself strikes at the root of any worthy conception of a great University. And it is in fundamental opposition to the judgment of the Royal Commissioners for Oxford and Cambridge, whose reports in 1852 still hold their ground as documents of the highest authority.

In place of a body of professors, appointed by the University, and possessing the *status* of University officers, there are to be teachers, in the appointment of whom the University will have no voice; collegiate teachers, and in the case of King's College, limited by previous subscription to the formularies of the Church of England. King's College and University College, along with the medical schools, will not only be the nucleus of the new University, but will, directly and indirectly, have a predominant voice in its

government; and, moreover, under the charter as it stands, will be the sole guarantees to the public for the independence and high standard of the degrees in arts and science.

I am but giving expression to an opinion widely diffused, in adding that the character and antecedents of the two colleges in whose interests mainly this charter has been devised, are not such as to inspire confidence in their ability to develop the new University upon those lines which you in your letter so well mark out—namely, that “the business of the Gresham University will be to gradually combine all the higher teaching given by the various agencies now at work in London, and to bring them into harmonious relations with one another, as rapidly as their own consent can be obtained, and their constitutions have been settled.”

And it may be fairly assumed that the indisposition to trust the two colleges, as the principal formative elements of the new University, was shared by the Royal Commissioners themselves. Not only do they recommend that, in a certain event, the subject should be remitted to themselves for further consideration and report, but (in a paragraph of their Report, No. 13, to which sufficient attention has not been given) they appear distinctly to negative the proposals made by the University and King's Colleges.

These objections, you will observe, are made exclusively in the interests of the higher education of London; and, if I may be permitted to speak of myself, I beg to add that I write as a University man, interested in all that concerns education, and without any other interest or prepossession whatsoever.

The inclusion of Gresham College in the scheme modifies some of these objections. But the public have no information as to the share which Gresham College will have in the government of the University, or as to its relation to the other colleges. And the action of the authorities of Gresham College seems to give increased force to the demand made for an enlargement of the scope of the scheme.

I propose to publish this letter, with any reply which you may be good enough to send me.—I am, my dear Bishop, yours very truly,

CHARLES S. ROUNDELL.

The Lord Bishop of London.

FULHAM PALACE, S.W.,
February 22, 1892.

MY DEAR ROUNDELL—I could not answer your letter at once because Convocation was sitting, and, busy as I am at all times, I am at that time quite unable to attend to anything but my ordinary routine duties. And I am much obliged by your willingness to grant my request of a few days' delay.

I have no doubt that you write as a University man, interested in all that concerns education, and without any other interest or prepossession whatever. And that there are others who take your view, irrespective of party and unconnected with existing institutions, is probable enough. But I venture to doubt the statement that there are many. I have discussed the matter with not a few, and until you wrote to me I never met one opponent who did not clearly show that he fell under one category or the other.

The Gresham University, you urge, will be without University teachers, and this, you say, strikes at the root of any worthy conception of a great University, and is in fundamental opposition to the Royal Commissioners for Oxford and Cambridge in 1852.

To say that the absence of University teachers strikes at the root of any worthy conception of a great University does not seem to help the discussion much. An abstract proposition like this means very different things according to the mode in which the words are defined.

The authority of the Royal Commissioners is weighty enough, but, in order to understand and apply it, it is necessary to look at the circumstances in which their opinion was given, and perhaps also to the results of the adoption of their recommendations.

Now, when the Commissioners visited Oxford—and you will let me confine myself to Oxford, which we both know best, and which illustrates what I have to say quite as well as if I included Cambridge also—they found the whole teaching of the University practically in the hands of the College tutors, supplemented by private tuition. The college tutors in each college were appointed by the Fellows from among themselves. The Fellows were elected on a system which made no pretence of selection by merit. The result was that what may be called the teaching staff of the University was visibly below the requirements of the best education. It was clearly imperative to remedy this as

speedily as possible, and there was clearly only one way of doing it—namely, to create a body of teachers who should be independent of the colleges, still hampered as they were by the restrictions imposed on them by the founders' wills, and whose teaching should be open to every member of the University.

It is certainly quite necessary to satisfy any fit conception of a great University that its teaching staff should consist of the best men that could be got, and that the arrangements should be such as to obtain such men and to keep them when obtained.

The professorships and readerships founded in accordance with the recommendation of the Commissioners are in the appointment of various boards of selection, in many of which the colleges that have supplied the needful endowments are represented. There are a few professorships, indeed, of older foundation that are directly appointed by the University itself in Convocation assembled; but I never heard any one maintain that this was the best or even a good mode of appointment.

And now, turning from 1852 to the interval that has elapsed since then, it is plain to every observer that the foundation of many new professorships, though necessary then and of great value since, has not done nearly so much for Oxford as the two great changes of opening the Fellowships to merit and allowing the Fellows to marry. The first has brought the ablest men easily to the front, so that suitable men for the work of teaching can always be found, and the second has enabled those men, when found, to make teaching the business of their lives.

When we apply the recommendations of the Royal Commissioners of 1852 to the case of London colleges in the proposed new University, we find that these colleges are not at all in these respects like the colleges at Oxford, nor their professors like the old college tutors. There is no body of Fellows to choose professors from among themselves, and to look on a tutorship or professorship as a piece of preferment at their disposal. The professors in each college are appointed by the College Council, a body of the same character as the boards of selection at Oxford, with no interest whatever except to get the very best man that can be got. And they are men of high eminence, from among whom Oxford and Cambridge have been glad to choose professors for some of their most important chairs.

Nor can it be said that, however eminent in themselves, they will still be only college professors, and will not have the dignity of a University position. The new Charter, on the contrary, makes them University officials of high rank by giving them a special representation on the governing council.

And if it be said that their lectures need not be open to members of the University who are not also members of the colleges, it is evident that the Gresham lectures must be open to all, and that there is nothing in the Charters of the other two colleges to prevent them from giving their professors a similar liberty, and when such liberty is wanted it will certainly be the interest of the colleges themselves to grant it. Nor have I any doubt that as more professorships are wanted they will be founded by the munificence of those who are interested in the education of London, some of such professorships being attached to one or other of the three colleges; others, perhaps, grouped, as the Gresham professorships are grouped, in new institutions with a right to enter the new University.

But you say that the character and antecedents of the two colleges are not such as to inspire confidence in their ability to develop the new University on the lines which I have marked out. I am well aware that the colleges are not valued as they ought to be by the general public. For the public has no means of judging of them except by the two tests of the attendance at their lectures and the academical honours won by their students. But the very reason why I have so warmly advocated their claim is because their history has convinced me that it was impossible, and always would be impossible, for the very best teachers to satisfy these tests, in the present position of the colleges. When the most eminent teachers find their classes almost emptied because they insist on teaching with a view to true mastery of the subject, and not with a view to passing an external examination, what room can there be for such tests as the public look to? The best men will fail in satisfying such tests as these in proportion to their originality, their independence of character, and their love of their subject. I wish you would read the report on these colleges by the Duke of Devonshire's Commission in 1874. I am convinced that the colleges have been earnestly endeavouring to fulfil their duties in the true University spirit, and that the estimate of them would have been very high in the public mind if they had had fair play.

It is to my mind certain that if the professors had their true place, as they would have under the new Charter, the very best men would be glad to enter the professoriate. The attraction of working in London would in itself be a most powerful magnet to bring them and to keep them.

I cannot admit your interpretation of paragraph 13 in the Report of the Commissioners. They speak of two schemes as ready for discussion, and proceed to discuss them. They mention a third as ready and possible, and do not discuss it at all. How this can mean that they not only prefer the first with certain modifications to the second, but condemn the second altogether, I fail to see. And still less can I so understand their language when I put beside it the fact that the Chairman of the Commission sat on the Privy Council when the Charter was granted, and took a leading part in the discussion which granted it.

In writing to me you have only just touched on another objection, and one of a very different nature, which I am well aware that many of the opponents of the Charter entertain—namely, the denominational character of King's College. There can be no question that this weighs with many, although you quite consistently exclude it from your letter, which is written independently of all party considerations.

I do not wish to dilate upon it. But I think it right to say that when I was an earnest advocate of the abolition of tests at Oxford I acted in the interests of justice. I thought it unjust that Nonconformists should be excluded from educational foundations which dated from times when our religious divisions were unknown. But I heartily concurred with Dean Stanley in the hope that denominational colleges would be founded afterwards, as Keble College and Mansfield College have since been founded.

The inclusion of denominational colleges in an undenominational University appears to me to be the true development of Liberal principles in application to education. The true advancement of Liberal principles is not to exclude from national purview the most important of all possible subjects, but to reconcile the inclusion of such subjects with strict justice to all.¹

In conclusion, let me point out the enormous importance, in providing such an institution as a new University, of

beginning with existing and living bodies. A paper constitution is easy to make, and it may be made to fit any theory that you like; it may satisfy ideal conditions; it may be deduced from high philosophical principles; but it almost invariably fails at one side or another, and ultimately works out into something quite different from what was intended. The University of London was intended to teach London, and has become an examining board for the world; and simply because its constitution cut it off from a living connexion with the teaching institutions of the Metropolis. If we are not to make the same mistake again we shall work on what we have got.

And when I put before my mind the purpose to be attained and the method for attaining it, I am quite unable to find any substance whatever in the objections that are made to the Charter; and I verily believe that if we can get that Charter confirmed there are many of our opponents who will be ready to confess this before very long.—Believe me, yours very truly,

F. LONDON :

C. S. Roundell, Esq.

APPENDIX C

RELIGIOUS ENDOWMENTS


“I am glad to see this morning a letter from Dr. Joseph Parker on this very point, that the State is to be at liberty to take away anything that the State originally gave, and he is rather staggered, I find, that such a plea as that is advanced. He does not say ‘Because the State gave it, the State has the right to take it away.’ That has never been the rule in any other case. There is no other property that is subject to such a rule. The State has never urged that plea before now. It has never been said that the State gave it and therefore the State may resume it. That plea is altogether new, and I maintain that it is altogether inconsistent with the whole course of justice in this land. I know that we did get something from the State. I was looking into it the other day. I had to look into it with some care, and I was looking particularly into the grants that were made at the

beginning of this century to the Church, which are every now and then quoted as instances of what the State then did. Well, the State did exactly what has been stated—that is, for some eleven or twelve years (I forget how many) the State year after year made a grant to the Church, and it was administered through Queen Anne's Bounty Office, and was treated exactly as other moneys which come to Queen Anne's Bounty Office are treated, and therefore we have the details at the Office; we know the exact amount granted every year, and we know what was done with it. But those who argue in this way altogether forget this important fact, viz., that when the State made these grants to the Church, similar grants were made at the same time to the various Nonconformist bodies in this country. They were all in a single vote. There was voted so much for the Church, so much for the Baptist denomination, so much for the Independent denomination, and so on. All these sums were voted together. It seems to me clear as daylight that, if we are to take away this money from the Church because the State gave it, we ought to take away what was granted to the Nonconformists as well."

CANTERBURY MEMOIR

1896—1902

**By The Venerable H. M. SPOONER, M.A., Archdeacon of
Maidstone, Canon of Canterbury**



THE OLD PALACE AND CANTERBURY CATHEDRAL.

CANTERBURY MEMOIR

Reception at Canterbury—Sale of Addington Park and rebuilding of the Old Palace, Canterbury—Consecration of the chapel—Reception in the Old Palace of the boys of the Cathedral choir—Sessions of the Diocesan Conference—Temperance—Education—Foreign Missions—Diocesan visits—Home at Canterbury—King's School, Canterbury—Citizenship—The last year: final visitation, meetings, and sermon—The last days.

BISHOP TEMPLE was translated to Canterbury at the age of seventy-five, a more advanced age than any of his predecessors, and, as was natural, his tenure of the See was a short one. He himself, on his appointment, remarked to a friend, "I have still five years' work in me," and his forecast was almost exact, for he died just as he had completed his sixth year as Archbishop. It was no wonder that the diocese as a whole welcomed his appointment with the greatest enthusiasm. His emphatic character, his simple, direct utterances, powerful from their very simplicity and directness—the life guided by a strong purpose which ran through the whole of it—made all men feel that it would have been impossible even at his advanced age to pass him over for the Primacy. This feeling was specially manifested in the city of Canterbury. The Mayor and citizens of Canterbury received him on the eve of his Enthronement with the same ceremonial and the same hearty welcome that they had offered to his predecessor. This included an address from the Mayor and Corporation presented to the Arch-

bishop in the Guildhall, and in the course of his reply he said :—

I confess I also regret very much that there is no kind of residence attached to the Archbishopric in this place. At my age, of course, I have not very many years to pass in the diocese, but I should be very glad indeed if I were able in course of time to make such arrangements as to make it possible to come here very frequently, and particularly on the occasions of great festivals of the Church. I should like, I confess, very much indeed to be always, if possible, here just about Easter, and to spend Easter Day, at least, among you, and the preceding week. And I should like to be here always at Whitsuntide, when, I suppose, most of you, like most of the rest of the world, are enjoying yourselves particularly, and when you are enjoying yourselves there is no one who will enter into the enjoyment more heartily than your Archbishop. I believe that the work of the Church is always best done by the effect of that personal influence which comes from personal contact, producing personal regard. I do not believe that there is any means by which men's hearts can be touched, and by which their whole minds can be lifted to higher things, better than that which is afforded by constant intercourse, man with man, in all the kindly associations and connexions which we have with one another in the ordinary course of life, and I do hope that, as time goes on, I shall at any rate here be able to make acquaintance with the whole of the people, and particularly those who are now in authority, and who have been so exceedingly kind in their welcome to me this afternoon.

These words recall the speech of his predecessor delivered fourteen years before under similar circumstances, and in the same place. Archbishop Benson's words were as follows :—

You express a desire that I should reside in the city of Canterbury. I must take it as showing great affection for me here, and I can only say I wish it might be so. I will say a little more—it ought to be so. The fact that it is not so is due to many circumstances not altogether such as cause satisfaction, but upon the whole it is due to the changes of time and circumstances that are going on. Changes, how-

ever, do not take place in one direction and then stop, and it may be that at some time the public will again say that the proper place for the Archbishop of Canterbury to reside in, is Canterbury itself. If they say that they will say well, and they will say that which ought to be. I only hope I may live to see it. I read some time ago in an old book, where a discontented priest says what would be right would be for every Bishop to have a little hospice of his own in his Cathedral City; but now the Cathedral Cities and the Bishops have so changed that it does not matter where the Bishop lives. That is a sentiment that I think we have outgrown. I hope some day the change you suggest may come to pass.

What was thus said by two Archbishops at an interval of fourteen years was the expression of a feeling that had been gaining strength in the minds of Church people in the diocese. Circumstances had altered materially since Archbishop Manners Sutton had purchased Addington Park as a country residence. Not only was the expense of keeping up a big country place with the diminished income of the See a serious burden, but also the inaccessibility of Addington to the diocese over which the Archbishop presides had been felt to be a serious drawback. In the earlier years of the century the Diocese of Canterbury had been a quiet, agricultural diocese. It was considered in those days sufficient if an Archbishop held confirmations in the more important parishes and attended occasional meetings in the principal towns. The spread of London and its suburbs in the western end of the county; and the growth of the watering-places both in importance and population all round the coast, as well as of the industrial towns on the banks of the Thames; the development of Croydon from a small market town into the most populous part of the diocese created problems with which the organisation of the past was incapable of dealing. Besides, the need of more constant meeting between

the Archbishop and his clergy pointed to the necessity of a change in the Archbishop's residence which should bring together those who were responsible for the work of the diocese. The opinion thus generally entertained (in which, to judge from his speech, the Archbishop himself concurred most heartily) he proceeded with characteristic energy to put into immediate effect. So determined was he in his own mind that Addington should no longer be the home of the Archbishops that he never even spent a night there after his accession to the See.

After gaining the consent of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners to the sale of Addington Park, early in 1897 he consulted their architect, Mr. W. D. Caröe, with a view to finding out whether any place in Canterbury would be suitable as a residence. Two schemes, one for adapting and enlarging a house belonging to one of the Canons Residentiary, and another for building a new house on land owned by the Ecclesiastical Commissioners near Harbledown, were considered, and, on further deliberation, rejected. In April, however, of 1898 the Archbishop occupied for a few weeks a house belonging to the Chapter, then tenanted by Sir James Lyall. The greater part of the building dated from the sixteenth century, and was on the site of the ancient Palace of the Archbishops, some interesting remains of which were incorporated in the more modern house, and throughout its changes the name of the "Old Palace" had clung to it. While residing there the Archbishop thus wrote to the architect ;—

April 8, 1898.

MY DEAR MR. CARÖE—I wish to suggest to you the following ruling idea for dealing with this house. Keep the present house as the dwelling-house, and improve it for that purpose. Add to it a business house containing Arch-

bishop's study, Chaplain's room, examination room, oratory ; improve the offices, especially the kitchen, now not large enough and too near the sitting-rooms. Add bedrooms in sufficient number. Take care that the Archbishop's study has sufficient light, rather more than sufficient, from the south. It need not be *very* large. Let communication be easy between Archbishop's study and Chaplain's room.—
Yours ever, F. CANTUAR.

The plan was submitted to the Dean and Chapter, who were glad to welcome the Archbishop as a permanent resident in the precincts, and to sell the Old Palace and as much land as could be spared for carrying out the design of Mr. Caröe.

Meanwhile, the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, who had agreed to the sale of Addington Park, had found a suitable purchaser in Mr. F. A. English, to whom the property was transferred in July 1898, and the work of building at Canterbury was commenced forthwith. On May 28, 1899, a memorial stone bearing the following inscription was laid by the Archbishop :—

ANTIQUAM DECESSORUM SUORUM DOMUM
POST ANNOS TRECENTOS RECEPTAM
FELICITER INAUGURAVIT
FREDERICUS ARCHIEPISCOPUS CANTUARIUS
POSITIS SUA MANU SACELLI NOVI FUNDAMENTIS
A.D. VI : KAL : JUN : MDCCCXCIX

In connexion with this ceremony, the following order of service was used. The Archbishop himself arranged it, and composed the final prayer :—

Form of Service for the laying of the Corner Stone of the Archbishop's Chapel, Saturday, May 27, 1899.

Hymn : " O Lord of Hosts, Whose glory fills " (A. and M.).
Psalms cxxi. and cxxii.

LAYING OF THE STONE . . .

Let us pray :—Lord have mercy upon us,
Christ have mercy upon us.

1. The Lord's Prayer. .

2. Whitsunday Collect.

3. "Prevent us, O Lord," etc.

4. O Lord, we pray Thee to bestow Thy gracious favour on the work which we are now beginning; make this Chapel a blessing for many generations to the worshippers who shall use it; may holy associations ever gather round it; may its quiet beauty touch the hearts and kindle the affections of all who enter it; and, above all, for those who shall pass from it to be ordained to the ministry of Thy Word, may it be filled with blessed memories of wise counsels and earnest exhortations here given, of youthful enthusiasm and resolute self-surrender here stirred to life; Grant this, O Lord, for the sake of Thy dear Son Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE BLESSING.

The work proceeded as rapidly as circumstances allowed, and before the close of the year 1900 the Palace was practically finished. Mr. Carøe, in a memorandum which he wrote with reference to the reconstruction of the Old Palace, says, "Some exceedingly valuable archæological discoveries were made as the works proceeded. The undercroft of the Refectory (of the original building) was found to be complete except for the groining; responds and springers being *in situ*. A portion of this has been opened to view, and is now visible at the east end of the Palace." The remainder of the undercroft is no doubt still in existence, but is under part of the garden of the house called "Chillenden Chambers," occupied by the Bishop of Dover. Another interesting relic of the mediæval building is a stone circular staircase.

The door from the present building holds the same position as that through which Archbishop Becket escaped into the Cathedral on the day of his murder. The most striking feature of the new building is the Chapel, the details of which were carefully considered and settled by the Archbishop in consultation with the architect. The wood-

work, both of the roof and the seats, is richly carved. Figures of notable Archbishops have been introduced, the likenesses, when possible, being derived from portraits at Lambeth. The Chapel was consecrated by the Archbishop, when he came down for the Easter recess, on April 11, 1901, and was dedicated to St. Anselm. The big room underneath it, which is used for diocesan gatherings and for the examination of candidates, was called by him "Theodore"—Anselm representing the learning and devotion, and Theodore the power of organisation amongst his predecessors. Inside the Chapel is the following inscription :—

AD MAJOREM DEI GLORIAM
SANCTIQUE ANSELMI PERPETUAM RECORDATIONEM
SACELLUM HOC RITE AC RELIGIOSE CONSECRAVIT
FREDERICUS CANTUARIUS
A.D. III IDUS APRILES MDCCCCL.

When it was known that the Chapel was to form an important part of the building of the Old Palace, a suggestion was made that to supply the furniture requisite for the sanctuary would be a graceful expression of the satisfaction felt at the Archbishop's intention to reside for a part of the year in his Cathedral City. A subscription was set on foot among the women of the diocese, and a sufficient sum was collected to provide two frontals, altar linen, alms-bags, and other necessities, as well as carpet and kneelers. There was also given an alms-dish, the work of the daughter of a clergyman in the diocese. In thanking for the gift the Archbishop wrote as follows to the wife of the Bishop of Dover :—

LAMBETH PALACE, S.E.,
April 27, 1904.

MY DEAR MRS. WALSH—May I ask you to be the messenger to convey my gratitude to the ladies of the Diocese who have presented to the Palace Chapel in Canterbury the beautiful

gifts which were included in the Consecration of the Chapel itself on the Thursday after Easter?

I have never seen more lovely or more suitable work than that of the frontals and fair linen; the carpets show the greatest skill and taste; the alms-dish is worthy of the use for which it is intended.

I am grateful indeed for all the trouble that has been taken by the kind givers to make our Chapel services so beautiful to see. The sympathy expressed by these costly offerings for our worship of God goes to my heart, and will, I hope, for generations to come, warm the hearts of many who, after we are gone, will continue to use them.—Believe me, affectionately yours,

F. CANTUAR.

The Archbishop, who had taken the greatest interest in arranging all the details of the building, was always delighted himself to show his friends, whether from the diocese or from a distance, over the house, which never lost its charm for him and Mrs. Temple to the end of his life.

Of the many hospitable gatherings that were held constantly in this home of his old age, none were more characteristic than that on Christmas Eve, 1901—his last on earth, when he and Mrs. Temple welcomed all the young people of the precincts with their parents, and the boys of the Cathedral Choir to a Christmas party. The host and hostess sat side by side at the head of the large tea-table, and afterwards entered into the fun of a charade acted by the choristers, the Archbishop guessing the word and explaining it in his own witty language. Finally, the whole party was gathered into the Chapel to sing a carol and a Christmas hymn, and before giving them his blessing he said a few words of Christmas teaching, concluding by saying, "You may like to remember in future years that we have all kept this Christmas together." None of those present will easily forget the scene, nor the kind shake of the hand with which he said good-night to each one, down to the very little



*The Archbishop and Mrs Temple
on their Silver Wedding Aug 27 1901*

ones who were taken by their mothers to bid him good-bye.

In the opening months of the year after his enthronement, the Archbishop's time and attention were necessarily very much occupied by the preparation for the great gathering of the bishops from all parts of the world, which took place in July. The Canterbury Diocesan Conference, which was usually held in that month, was consequently postponed till October. This Conference was the first opportunity given to the Archbishop of meeting his clergy and laity since his translation. He commenced his address as follows :—

I bid you very heartily welcome to Lambeth Palace on this occasion. It will not, I trust, be the last occasion on which I shall bid you welcome in the same place, and I hope that this large Conference will do its share in the promotion of the efficiency of Church work throughout the Diocese.

He also, in the same address, spoke of the difficulties which beset every Archbishop of Canterbury in meeting the demands made upon his time, but expressed a hope that he would be able to take one-third of the Confirmations each year, as he had done in the Diocese of London. This would in a short time enable him to become acquainted with the various parishes in the diocese. He also felt that invitations to preach and speak from various parts of the province of Canterbury were not lightly to be dismissed, and, referring to invitations he had received from the Northern Province, quoted the remark of a correspondent that as “Primate of all England I had better remember there was a North of England.”

He made use of the annual recurrence of the Conference to speak his mind to the diocese on various subjects bearing on Church work. Thus on one occasion he urged on his clergy the necessity

of study. Again, in 1898, he dealt with the agitation about Ritualism, which was then troubling people's minds ; and the next year, when the question of the constitution of the new Diocese of Southwark was under consideration, he naturally spoke about the proposed rearrangement of the boundaries of the Canterbury Diocese, which would be necessitated if the scheme were carried into effect. In 1900, the year of the Bi-Centenary of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, he devoted the whole of his speech to an earnest appeal on behalf of foreign missions. In addressing the last Diocesan Conference over which he presided, in 1901, when legislation on education was imminent, the tone of hope and encouragement in which he usually faced difficult questions seemed rather to have failed him.

I a little doubt (he said in conclusion) whether the laity quite realise how very much is involved in the question of really upholding the voluntary schools and upholding the religious teaching in them. I a little doubt this, and yet it seems to me to be worth purchasing at a very considerable cost, and I do not see a general desire to rise to the demand, and we can of course only do what is within our reach. It is rather depressing to speak in this tone about a matter which is of so very grave importance.

Though arrangements were made for the Conference in 1902, it had to be abandoned, at the last minute, owing to the Archbishop's being laid up with an attack of illness.

In looking forward to his work at Canterbury on his appointment, the Archbishop is reported to have said that there were three subjects of paramount importance and interest to the Church to which he hoped specially to devote his remaining energies. These were the Temperance Question, the Foreign Missions of the Church, and the Education Question. They were matters the scope of

which reached far beyond the limits of his own diocese; but the view which he thus expressed could not fail to colour his action and determine the direction of his energies.

The Temperance Society was already a flourishing diocesan institution in 1896, but there is no doubt that the interest which the Archbishop always evinced in this particular work not only led to its extension, but infused into it new life and spirit.

Keen as he was to enlist into the work all men, and especially the clergy, he always avoided even the appearance of bringing undue pressure to bear on those under his ecclesiastical rule. And thus for some time he refused to follow the example of nearly every bishop in England, in writing a letter commending to his clergy the claims of temperance, and when urged to do so he justified his refusal by saying "that all the clergy knew his point of view, and that there were not wanting those who suggested that favour was to be won by adhesion to what some were pleased to call the Archbishop's fad. He had never made any difference in his attitude towards men who took up or did not take up temperance work, and he did not value the work of a man who was simply carrying on the Church of England Temperance Society because he wished to please the Archbishop." He spoke, however, to his clergy on more than one occasion with striking effect, his words at the Diocesan Conference, 1899, being specially noteworthy:—

I wish very much that the Diocese would take up more heartily than it does the work of the Church of England Temperance Society. I believe that work to be of real value to the Church at large, and I believe that if it was taken up by the clergy generally, there is hardly anything that ought to be done that could not be done.

At length, however, after the publication of the Reports on the Commission of the Licensing

Laws, he consented to address a letter to the clergy of the diocese :—

OLD PALACE, CANTERBURY,
January 1, 1901.

The present position of the temperance question seems to demand the special attention of the clergy of the Church. The Reports of the late Commission on the subject point out various improvements that ought to be made in the laws relating to licences for the sale of intoxicating liquors, and though the reports are two, yet the recommendations that are common to both Reports, and consequently carry the authority of the whole body of Commissioners, are numerous and important. The Bishops are united in supporting them; and if the clergy would seriously press for them they would certainly be carried sooner or later. The basis of all improvements in this matter must be the formation of a strong public opinion, and the clergy have more influence than any others in producing this effect.

Of all the hindrances to the acceptance of the truth of the Gospel, there is none more widespread, more infectious, more potent than intemperance, and we could do much if we bestirred ourselves to stem this current of evil.

F. CANTUAR.

A feature in the work of the Church of England Temperance Society had been for some years the celebration of an annual festival at central places in the diocese. This was now extended to a week. The Archbishop, when appealed to, consented himself to give up two whole days to preaching and speaking. He not infrequently preached twice on the Sunday, and gave two or three addresses on the Monday. A characteristic incident took place in connexion with one of these festivals. The Archbishop had promised to preach in a certain church, and, in order to keep his engagement, proposed to travel on Sunday morning from Lambeth. The clergyman of the church took exception to His Grace's travelling on the Sunday, and stated his inability to receive him under the circumstances. This might have given rise to a difficulty, more

especially as the Mayor of the place had agreed to attend in state. When the situation was made known to the Archbishop, a reply came by return of post :—

DEAR —,—Find me another church.—Yours truly,
F. CANTUAR.

A striking feature about the Archbishop's speeches on these occasions was a manifest strain of sympathetic feeling; as is often the case with strong men, his strength was joined with great tenderness of heart, and when in speaking he recalled individual cases of careers ruined by drink, his broken voice and the tears in his eyes proved how deeply he felt for those who were slaves to the evil habit. Any one present at a meeting at Dover will not forget how he described, with a pathos which made many of his auditors catch their breath, that he had resolved to become a total abstainer on hearing a piteous appeal in his own library at Exeter, from a man who described himself as "that most degraded of all creatures, a drunken clergyman."

The vicar of St. Mary's, Dover, with whom he stayed for this festival, was impressed with his untiring energy. His first remark as he took off his coat in the hall was, "What's to be done next?" and rest and repose seemed the last thing that occurred to him.

He never once sat in an easy-chair, and even after a long evening meeting, when he had spent himself unsparingly, would deliberately choose the hardest chair in the room, and sit bolt upright till he went to bed. Nevertheless, one noticed also, for the first time, a wistful note of presage of the end. "There was a time," he said, as we walked to our morning service, "when I could walk any pace or any distance; can't do it now." *Semper agens, semper quietus*, was equally true of him throughout. For example, when

my wife came into the drawing-room, on the second day of his visit, without knowing that he was there, and said, "I hope I am not disturbing you?" he replied, characteristically, "I am incapable of being disturbed."

The ground which the temperance movement has gained among thoughtful and reasonable people, both in the diocese and in England at large, is no doubt due very considerably to the attitude taken up by the Archbishop on this subject. He never fell into the error to which some enthusiastic advocates of the cause are liable, of using extravagant language with regard to those who are engaged in the liquor trade, or of enforcing the necessity of total abstinence on all people alike. He loyally accepted the dual basis of the Church of England Temperance Society, which recognises the co-operation of those who are anxious to lessen intemperance though not themselves total abstainers. The line he usually took was this: "Here is a great and manifest evil to which no thoughtful person can shut his eyes. Can Christian men and women reconcile it with their consciences to witness the disastrous effects of this national vice, and not stir hand or foot to arrest its progress?"

He was quite content to leave it to each individual conscience to determine what should be done; what he did insist upon with repeated vehemence was that the evil must not be left alone. Hence he was willing to hold out a friendly hand to every movement, whether within the Church or outside it, which attempted to grapple with the difficulty. In illustration of this broad-minded policy the Bishop of Croydon writes: "His inspiring influence as a leader was felt by all classes; fully as much by Nonconformists as by Church people. This had a unifying effect upon the temperance of the place, and helped much in enabling us to form a United Temperance Council,

which, by bringing all the forces of the movement into line, rendered it possible to concentrate our efforts on some particular point—to wit, Brewster Sessions and the granting of new licences, which gave us an influence and power we should not otherwise have had.” What Bishop Pereira thus writes of Croydon is equally true of Canterbury and other towns in the diocese.

The Archbishop with his antecedents of Kneller Hall and Rugby was well known both as an educational reformer and as one of the greatest living authorities on the subject of education. And while dealing as Primate with the wider aspects of the educational policy to be pursued by Church people, at the same time he devoted considerable time and attention to the details of the work which the Diocesan Education Society was carrying on in the diocese.

He frequently took part in the deliberations of the Diocesan Education Board. In the year 1897 the Act was passed which gave the Aid Grant to voluntary schools, the distribution of which was entrusted to the governing body in each diocese. This involved an immense amount of labour in apportioning the amount due to each individual school. The Archbishop himself did not shirk his share of this labour. He presided at the meeting of the Sub-Committee which undertook this difficult task. The following incident illustrates his energy and power of work when he was nearer eighty than seventy. The Committee at their first distribution allotted a large portion of the grant in clearing off all debts. It was afterwards ruled by the law officers of the Crown that this use could not be made of the money. The Committee had consequently to go over the whole work afresh. The Archbishop presided at all these extra meetings, and hour after hour paid the closest attention

to the work. Towards the close, in answer to his question as to the amount still remaining to be divided, the secretary said — “Roughly speaking, there is £300,” to which the Archbishop rejoined, “There is no such thing as roughly speaking, I want the exact sum in pounds, shillings, and pence.” As is known to all who have had experience in the administration of the Aid Grant, its distribution was a difficult and delicate matter, as the local Committees, whose advice was sought, rather resented their decisions being over-ruled. At one time there was a tendency on the part of some to regard the Aid Grant from a parochial rather than a diocesan point of view. The Archbishop being informed of this, at once summoned the Rural Deans of the diocese together. The meeting was a very short one, but he made the Rural Deans understand that the diocesan was the aspect from which the whole question was to be regarded.

The annual meeting of the Diocesan Education Society has of late years taken place in the early part of the year, before the meeting of Parliament, in one of the chief towns of the diocese, and the principal laymen have made a point of attending to support the Archbishop. From a diocesan point of view, the president’s address has always been received with considerable interest. Archbishop Temple took this opportunity of impressing his own view as to the duty in this matter incumbent on those living in the diocese. Thus in 1900, when the meeting was held at Dover, he gave a short sketch of the work of the Diocesan Board of Education from its commencement in 1839.

We did not do enough! We did not get subscriptions for that most important Board, nor did we get collections made in half the parishes of the Diocese. It was, as it seemed to him, neglecting a very serious and most important duty; it was refusing to take a part in that

which was vital to the interests of the whole Church; it was standing aloof from a kind of work in which the whole Church was necessarily engaged, and the neglect of which would certainly not fail to bring serious punishment upon us in the progress of time. The Report described what had been done, but we had not come to the end yet, nor were we near it. We had still to go on, and secondary education must necessarily be organised as primary education had been already. We should see to it that in secondary schools there should be the same religious instruction we had endeavoured to give in the elementary schools. We had to see to it that the instruction in religion should form as large a part of the work of those schools as it had done in the England of old. He was struck a short time since with a review in a French magazine of the Duke of Wellington's despatches, in which the writer said he had not been able to find the word "glory," but the word which perpetually came up until he was tired of it was the word "duty." And if any one watched history he knew, if he knew England, that they learned the word out of the Church Catechism. There could be no doubt that the position the word held had been driven into the hearts of Englishmen by the instruction of perpetual generations in that which was so wonderful a formulary.

The Archbishop's advocacy of the cause of the Foreign Missions of the Church was frequent. In London he was often called upon to speak both for the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel and the Church Missionary Society, and in the year in which was celebrated the Bi-Centenary of the former Society, he made oft-repeated appeals to those within the diocese. It has been already mentioned how he devoted to this subject his opening address to the Diocesan Conference in July 1901. The following speech, which is typical of the line he took in impressing the duty of supporting Missions, was delivered at a meeting at Sevenoaks on February 15 of that year:—

There were three things which he thought he might put before them as indicating the call that God's Providence

had made upon them to take up this work very heartily. In the first place, the existence of this Society and the steady growth of its operations was a call. They were already doing a work, not at all in proportion to the need, not at all in proportion to their opportunities, not at all in proportion to the imperative command which the Lord gave us. Still they were doing the work in some measure, and it had been blessed by God and was still going on, and there was every prospect that it would prosper in their hands quite as speedily as could be expected from the exertions that they themselves made. That was one thing to be considered. Here was a Society which was actually doing a good work, and doing it successfully. In the next place, every one had been struck with the remarkable phenomenon which had characterised the last century, and which had made a very great difference in the facilities for doing this work. The great characteristic of the past century had been the extraordinary facility of intercourse between man and man. Science had made great differences in dealing with men's lives and health and comfort, but there was no advance which had been made which was more striking and more likely to be fruitful than that made in the power of perpetual intercourse between the nations of the earth. The power of visiting distant nations had so much increased that when they looked back it seemed as if some miraculous change had come over the world. It was easier for us now to reach the Antipodes than it would have been 200 years ago to reach the northern coast of Africa. It was easier far to get information from the Antipodes and to know what they are doing there than it would have been only fifty or sixty years ago. The telegraph and telephone were constantly keeping us informed of everything taking place which concerned us or our interests all over the world. This was a new state of things altogether, and we knew the world a great deal better in consequence. Foreign countries and heathen nations knew more about us and we about them, than would have been dreamed of at the beginning of the last century. So this facility of intercourse had made that which was once a very difficult business, a matter requiring nothing more than zeal and perseverance. To preach the Gospel to the heathen all over the world was, a hundred years ago, a very serious undertaking indeed. It required men to face great perils. They had to overcome all kinds of obstacles, in fact there was hindrance to the work at every

turn. Now, on the contrary, the way was opened in a most marvellous manner. All the great difficulties were gone. He did not mean to say that there were no dangers still. They had only to think of brothers of theirs who had gone through the troubles in China in order to recognise that the persecution of the Cross had not ceased, and there were other dangers besides those of such persecution. Yes, there were no doubt dangers, and very grave ones, but they were nothing in comparison to what they once were. All the opportunities of getting at the world at large and giving the heathen the message of the Gospel had suddenly been multiplied by the Providence of God far more than a hundredfold. To this was to be added a very remarkable fact, which he did not know that any one could easily account for. It was that the population of these, the British Isles, during the last 100 years, had increased with a rapidity absolutely unknown in any other nation except our own. They could point to nations that had increased very much, but to none that had increased from within in the same proportion as we had. The United States had increased very much, but that was due in a large measure to the influx of immigrants. The birth-rate had not been anything remarkable there, whilst it had been very remarkable here. In England, above all other nations, the population had enormously increased, and the consequence had been a pouring forth of our brothers and sisters all over the world. These colonies had grown with extraordinary rapidity. This was a phenomenon which was striking when they looked over the history of the past and over the world at large. It was not a thing that people were very ready to notice, but when once their attention was directed to it, they would see at once that it was something most remarkable. It was to this we owed the fact that the colonies of this country were more numerous, and were growing more and more whatever other nation they liked to choose in comparison.

These were three great facts—the increase of our own population, filling our colonies, swelling the populations there, and consequently giving a sort of foothold for the Gospel to be preached in so many different parts of the world; next, the extraordinary increase in facilities, which gave us access to all the world in quite new forms; thirdly, the fact that this Society of theirs was ready, and had shown its readiness to take up this work as fast as the English nation and the Church of England would assist it to do so.

With these indications of the will of God manifested by His providential government of the world ; with these remarkable indications which he had put before them the more earnestly because they were really new things in human history ; with these indications of God's call, he thought it was plain enough that the English nation and the English Church had been called to a work in God's name, and that every one of them was bound to listen to that call, and do his share towards working at what our Lord left as His last message to all Christians, "To go and preach to all nations." We ought, within no long time, to make it clear to all the nations of the world that there was no heathen tribe, no nation whatever, which should not have the opportunity of learning God's message to mankind, and of joining in the fellowship of the great Christian body. It seemed to him a very powerful call, and if they could awake (the English nation was not easily awakened), but if they could awake men to a sense of their duty as Christians, then, he thought, there might be some hope of their fulfilling the task which our Almighty Father had placed upon us, in some form or other, corresponding to the advantages which He had assigned to us for doing such a work as this. In His name the ministers of the Church of England were bound to call upon the people of the Church of England to take up this work, and carry it on with the utmost zeal and the most steady perseverance.

To attempt to measure the influence of Archbishop Temple in the diocese by a review of what he did would be misleading. A man of his force of character was bound to impress and influence all those with whom he came in contact, and still more those associated with him in work. His own untiring energy and zeal, even at his advanced age, afforded an example which inspired and amazed all who witnessed it in life. It was literally true that he never considered himself, nor did he seem to realise, even in later years, that what had been easy for him in the vigour of his age, might overtax his strength when he had passed his threescore years and ten. When applications were made to him to preach or speak, his impulse was always to say

“Yes,” unless some existing engagement stood in the way. Consequently, he was able to visit a very considerable number of parishes in the diocese, either for the purpose of holding Confirmations or of preaching.

The more important centres naturally had a prior claim on his time, and he visited places like Croydon, Maidstone, Ashford, and Tunbridge Wells, and the populous watering-places round the coast pretty regularly. When he was established in the Old Palace at Canterbury he was within easy reach of all the important places on the coast in East Kent, and from Lambeth it was a short run to places in the west of the county, nor did he fail to make use of his opportunities so far as his many engagements in London during the session of Parliament permitted. In arranging the list of Confirmations he made a point, as far as possible, of going himself to the more important schools, like Tonbridge. His interest in and love for the English schoolboy was ever fresh, and the many years at Rugby, instead of blunting his feelings, had only quickened them. The effect of his sermons and speeches wherever he went, whether to the more populous towns or to country parishes, was the same. All who heard him felt that they had been brought into contact with a great character. What he said, though not adorned by flights of oratory, went straight to the hearts and consciences of his audience, being the outcome of his own sincerity of conviction and earnestness of purpose. It mattered not to him whether he addressed large congregations, or the number which had assembled within the walls of some small country church. He was equally interested in either, and, having his message to deliver, he gave utterance to it with the same desire to use the opportunity in his Master's cause. I cannot forget the sort of

remarks made to me after he had held a Confirmation in the parish of Saltwood. Most of the candidates were children of labourers. "Was that really the Archbishop? I heard it was and could not believe it. He was so plain, he seemed to know everything about us."

Mr. Monckton, Town Clerk of Maidstone, well described the impression made by his visits to that town. "The Archbishop took deep interest not only in the churches of the borough, but also in that remarkable Church Institute (as he called it), cultivating the whole man, his body as well as his soul." The leading feature of his intercourse with Maidstone, and one never to be forgotten by the inhabitants, was in the eventful year 1897, when the town was stricken with the terrible typhoid epidemic. The value of his help, of his touching letter of sympathy addressed to the Vicar, and, above all, of his presence in the midst of the plague-smitten town, cannot be over estimated.

Driven almost to despair by the rapid spread of the dire disease, the inhabitants were crushed by the morning bulletins of fresh outbreaks, reaching at last nineteen hundred cases, with trade paralysed, and people fleeing and shunning the town; when the calm, heroic presence of the Archbishop in the pulpit of All Saints' Church sent a thrill of encouragement and hope throughout the borough. The Angel of Death was hovering over the town, he said in his sermon; you could almost hear the fluttering of his wings in the streets.¹ Later on, at a Mayor's reception, he remarked, "The way the inhabitants had endeavoured to meet their trouble was a lesson to all England." Little did he know that such qualities were engendered by the untold generosity of people throughout the kingdom,

¹ This is apparently a reminiscence of a speech of Mr. John Bright during the Crimean War.—ED.

coupled with His Grace's own stout, unflinching support.

Again, Canon Tindall writes :—

Archbishop Temple visited Ashford five times during the period he was Archbishop. The first occasion was to deliver his Visitation Charge in October 1898. Both the solemn and thoughtful words of his Charge on Confession and his genial, kindly hospitality at the lunch that followed, seemed at once to win the hearts of both laity and clergy.

A clergyman from Romney Marsh wrote and asked the Archbishop to hold a Confirmation after his Charge, and, in spite of the fatigue of such a week, His Grace consented, and with a congregation of about twenty-five to thirty people, confirmed three candidates and gave them an address beautiful in its simplicity and sympathy.

The second occasion was to preach one Sunday evening in November 1898. The sermon was a remarkable one. The Archbishop put the deepest thoughts of our relation to God and our duty to man in the simplest language. He kept an enormous congregation, which was conspicuous for the large number of men present, in wrapt attention for over half an hour, and in our Railway Works all the next week, and among the professional men in the town, the sermon had evidently left a deep impression, and was the general topic of conversation. Personally, I think he was the greatest man I ever met, and I never remember any one who filled me with such a feeling of respect and reverence as Archbishop Temple.

In reviewing the work of the diocese during Archbishop Temple's term of office, it would be unsuitable not to mention the help which Mrs. Temple contributed to the women's branches of it, aided by the experience she had gained in Exeter and London.

After the completion of the Old Palace, the Archbishop's times of residence in Canterbury became much more frequent. When released from his engagements in town, he came at once to Canterbury for the Easter recess, and again at Whitsuntide, when he received into his house the candidates for ordination. Latterly even his

autumn holiday was spent in Canterbury. He found great repose there, as he had the place almost to himself during the absence of most of the inhabitants of the Precincts, who were taking their autumn holidays elsewhere.

For the rest of the year, except when called away to speak at the Church Congress, or to attend a Bishops' meeting at Lambeth, the gathering of Rural Deans of the diocese, or the not infrequent calls to speak and preach in various parts of England, his headquarters were at Canterbury. He thus spent the great festivals of the Church in his Cathedral City, as in his first speech in Canterbury he said he hoped to do, and he hardly ever failed on these occasions to preach at the evening service in the Cathedral, when the inhabitants of the city crowded to hear him.

The Archbishop's presence in Canterbury enabled many of the clergy and laity in the diocese not only to know him personally, but to consult him on questions affecting their work. He was singularly accessible and ever ready to give them counsel. Those who had the privilege of working with him and knowing him intimately bear consistent witness to the considerate manner in which he received suggestions and gave due weight to other people's opinions.

The Archbishop has been accused of brusqueness, the semblance of which was caused by his habit of saying plainly and directly whatever he had in his mind, but he was equally ready that others should use to him the same plainness of speech. One writes :— •

He was patient of criticism. He liked you to speak out and to speak out plainly ; and in return he spoke plainly too. "I don't agree with you," was not unfrequently the reply, though on other occasions the speaking out made him change his mind.

Another uses much the same language :—

I do not know a man to whom it was easier to go and tell out what was in one's mind. It always seemed to me that he was better pleased the more directly and simply one could express one's opinion on any matter.

His unwillingness to receive thanks at public meetings was well known, but he did not carry his principles into practice when others had done anything for him. His expression of gratitude was full and hearty. A correspondent tells me how after he had, at the Archbishop's request, given addresses in Ember Week to the candidates for ordination, the Archbishop put his hand on his shoulder and said, "I am very, very much obliged." When in remonstrance he said, "Why, when you never will be thanked yourself, do you break your own rule?" he simply repeated his former words.

His letters were brief but very much to the point, and seldom reached the third page.

The Archbishop's connexion with the King's School became closer than had been possible in the case of his predecessors. With his well-known love for boys he was not likely to neglect the opportunity of showing an interest in the school, of the existence of which he was daily reminded, when in Canterbury, as the playground of the Junior School was just under the Old Palace windows. Founded about the year 620 A.D., the school was known from that date up to the days of the Reformation as the "Free School of the City of Canterbury." The Archbishop was its patron and appointed the Headmaster. When the Monastery was dissolved in 1541 and the Cathedral Body was organised, the Ancient Free School was made an integral part of the Cathedral Foundation. The patronage was then vested in the Dean and Chapter as the new governing body, and the Archbishop became the

Visitor of the School, which before long came to be called the King's School.

For the past twenty or twenty-five years it has been customary for the Captain of the School, with the approval of the Headmaster, or the Dean, to call upon the Archbishop and present a request that he would name a date on which it would be convenient for him to pay his official visit to the School. Since the rebuilding of the Old Palace this visit has usually been paid in December, when the Archbishop left Lambeth to take up his residence in Canterbury for the winter months.

On the morning arranged the Archbishop, attended by his Chaplain, walks from the Old Palace to the Deanery, where he is met by the Dean and Chapter, and also not unfrequently by the Mayor. He is then conducted through the Green Court towards the schoolroom, which occupies the site of the Great Hall of the Monastery.

At the foot of the Norman staircase (well known to all who have visited Canterbury) leading up to this Hall, the Headmaster and his colleagues await his arrival, and the Dean presents the Headmaster to the Visitor. The boys are assembled in the schoolroom, and the Visitor usually gives them an address.

It was on such an occasion that Archbishop Temple, in two consecutive years, took part in the ceremony, first of laying the foundation stone of a new building required by the increasing numbers of the School, and again of opening the new building when completed.

On the former occasion he took as his subject "Work"—

If the boys would not work the master could not teach, and so much was this the case that the great qualification, which ranked above almost every other in a teacher, was that

he should be able to make it easy for the boys to study in preparation for his lessons. The great thing was that they should do their duty, and do it as if they liked it, compelling themselves to like it. This, too, was one of the finest trainings for the formation of character. They must practise self-sacrifice—never spare time or trouble to do things well, and remember always that all depended not so much on the knowledge they would thus acquire, valuable as that might be, as on the spirit in which they cultivated their own character and reduced it constantly to that rule.

On the latter occasion he spoke to them of holidays :—

His chief advice to the boys must consist in telling them how to spend their holidays. He would therefore say that their main purpose should be to make their own people at home as happy as they could. They were very glad to have them, at the same time he must warn them by his own experience that there was a possibility of their being great plagues. It was good to warn them beforehand that their business was to make every one happy, even at cost to themselves. Every little act of unselfishness, self-control, of keeping their temper when something was rather vexatious, every little act of self-sacrifice, went a long way in making all those with whom they lived happier than they would be without them

It was not only in matters connected with the Cathedral that the Archbishop took a genuine interest. No man ever had broader sympathies, and he was as much at the call of the civic authorities as he was ready to take part in ecclesiastical functions. To be a good citizen was to his mind included in being a good Christian, and he made a point of being present, whenever it was possible, at civic functions. Whether some important personage was received in Canterbury—as for instance Lord Roberts shortly after his return from South Africa—or an inauguration like that of the new building of the Canterbury Dispensary took place, there the Archbishop was to be found ; and as he

had said in his first speech that he was ready to join his fellow-citizens in play or in work, so he hardly ever was absent from the banquet which the Mayor gave on his election to office, and his genial humour made his speeches on those occasions a welcome part of the evening's entertainment. I cannot do better than quote what has been written by Sir George Collard, whose mayoralty covered most of the years of Archbishop Temple's time in Canterbury:—

Always desirous to become acquainted with and to support the authorities of the city, His Grace, whenever it was possible for him to attend, honoured the mayoral banquet with his presence, and always cheerfully and readily gave his presence and valuable support on the occasion of any important city function. In a word, his splendid example of good citizenship was one to be studied and followed by all, and the deep and loyal interest he had in his heart for our city of Canterbury, and for all that concerned its best interests and the happiness of its people, was such that his name will always be remembered by the citizens of to-day and their successors, with a deep reverence and undying love such as only the life of a great and good citizen can command.

The last year of the Archbishop's life opened with the prospect of many difficult questions to be considered and much anxious work to be got through. The education policy of the Government was unfolded in the Bill presented to Parliament, and when its contents were studied, not only were the adverse criticisms of its declared enemies severe, but the welcome from those who might have been expected to be friendly to the measure was but lukewarm. The King's Coronation was impending, and the form of the service had to be carefully gone through, and was in some particulars revised by the Archbishop in consultation with the King. This made no inconsiderable demands on the Archbishop's time, and in the late autumn his second quadriennial visitation of the diocese was

due. There was enough before him to task the energies of a man in the full vigour of life, and those immediately around the Archbishop could not disguise from themselves that the power of getting through work, which had distinguished him among his contemporaries, was beginning seriously to fail. He was himself hardly conscious of the change, and was as ready as ever to undertake the many duties which devolved on him, and no idea of sparing himself seemed ever to occur to his mind. But there was an attack of illness which confined him to his bed when he had returned to Lambeth after the Whitsuntide recess, spent as usual at Canterbury. This obliged him to put off the Diocesan Conference, which had been fixed for an early date in June in expectation of the King's Coronation taking place in July; and though at the time he expressed his intention of holding the Conference later in the year, he finally decided to omit it altogether, in view of his visitation of the diocese and other engagements after Michaelmas, including the Session of Parliament summoned to carry through the Education Bill.

The failure in his power of locomotion was most noticeable. When at Canterbury he had been in the habit of attending the daily service, and occupied the stall next to the pulpit, but now the steep flight of stairs which ascends from the nave to the choir began to try his steps, and when he came back from London he contented himself with a seat in the nave itself for the daily service, though he always appeared in the 'Treasury'¹ on Sundays to join in the procession with the Cathedral clergy. To the Coronation Ceremony he had looked forward with the keenest interest, and always expressed the hope that he might be able to crown the Sovereign. His wish was fulfilled when, after the delay caused

¹ The 'Treasury' is used as the Canons' Vestry.

by the King's sudden illness, he took his appointed part in the service in the Abbey on the 9th August. It will be fresh in the memory of all how the Archbishop, when tired by the length of the ceremony he found it difficult to rise after doing homage, was tenderly helped by the King.

The months between the Coronation and the Visitation of the diocese were quietly spent in the Old Palace at Canterbury, in the usual routine of business and in the preparation of his Charge which he had to deliver in October.

When October came Mrs. Temple was, unfortunately, suffering from an attack of bronchitis, and this naturally caused the Archbishop some anxiety, and made him feel it necessary to return home every night from the Visitation Centres. The Charge was delivered, in five parts, at five different places, commencing with the Visitation of the Cathedral Body at Canterbury. On the occasions when the churchwardens were summoned together with the clergy, they both were entertained at luncheon by the Archbishop after the conclusion of the service in church. The delivery of several speeches at this luncheon, after a long and tiring service, was a great strain on the Archbishop, but it was remarkable with what renewed energy and spirit he spoke to the guests who assembled to meet him. And as he told those present on one occasion how he hoped he might be spared to see another Visitation, it almost seemed as if his life might be prolonged to that extent. Almost immediately after the Visitation, while he was still in anxiety on account of his wife's illness, he determined to keep an engagement he had made to speak at an important meeting at Salisbury, held in connexion with the annual gathering of the Church of England Temperance Society from all parts of England. No one could have

blamed him if, under the circumstances, he had asked to be excused, but when he found it was possible in the day to reach Salisbury and get back to Canterbury the same evening, he wrote to say he should come. The meeting was at three o'clock in the afternoon, and he arrived just in time to make the first speech after the Bishop of Salisbury had opened the meeting. Those who had heard him speak on several occasions on temperance, thought he never had spoken with more vigour or with more effect. It was certainly a great effort for a man of his years and in his then condition of health, but it was only another instance of the simple, unaffected manner in which he took it as a matter of course to do the thing he had in hand, at whatsoever cost to himself. He attended about the same time the Diocesan Temperance Festival at Ramsgate, coming down from London and returning the same day. He took the chair at a business meeting in the morning, and spoke on temperance at the reception which the Mayor gave to visitors from all parts of the diocese, and then took the train home. His increasing inability to walk caused him considerable trouble and a certain amount of pain when stairs had to be mounted, but when he was in residence at the Old Palace he was still in his place in the Cathedral on Sundays. In the last week before his return to Lambeth for the Autumn Session of Parliament, he both preached in the Cathedral and presided at a large meeting organised in Canterbury by the Committee for Church Defence and Church Instruction, which was held in St. Andrew's Parish Hall.

The sermon in the Cathedral was preached on Advent Sunday, which also fell this year on his birthday—completing his eighty-first year. He took as his text 1 Cor. ix. 16-17. It was one of the days appointed of late years in our Church for

intercession on behalf of Foreign Missions. He urged the duty laid on all Church people of doing their utmost in the cause, and he concluded his sermon with these words :—

So I pray you, as this day has been appointed for intercession for Foreign Missions, let us take care that our hearts are not deaf to the summons which is made to us all by the appointment of this day for the purpose of putting before our minds what it is that God is saying to us now. He calls, He sends us forward, and let us not be neglectful of His voice and His guidance. Let us not be so blind as not to see what are His purposes, and when we see let us act upon this plain resolution and do what He desires us to do, for it is with us as with St. Paul, “Woe be to us” if we neglect so great a call. We have received this blessing from the Lord, and let us not be deaf to His wonderful and gracious voice, for He loves us and there is no other love like His. Assuredly it is His love that calls us—us particularly—to do this work, and His call will not fail to carry us on to great success. His call will not fail to make us know that if we are not too sluggish to understand it, the Lord will recognise all our labours and carry them on by His own Almighty power.

It was the last time his voice was heard in the Cathedral, and those who were present could not but feel it likely that they would never hear him preach again. There was indeed no lack of vigour or earnestness in his delivery, and his voice was as strong and clear as it had ever been, but he evidently spoke with considerable effort, and the strain of doing so was apparent. When the service was ended and he attempted to walk, his tottering steps had to be supported on either side, and it was with great difficulty that he descended the stair which leads down into the “Martyrdom,” where his wheel-chair waited for him, to take him through the cloisters to his house. This evidence of failing strength made those around him anxious. It seemed doubtful whether he would be able to

keep his engagement to speak at the public meeting on the Tuesday. He had scarcely ever broken an engagement in his public life, and he did not like the idea of giving up when duty seemed to call. So after a day's rest he said he was able to take the chair and to preside, as he had promised, at St. Andrew's Hall. The room was crowded, for the clergy had flocked in to support the Archbishop, not only from the immediate neighbourhood of the city, but also from places on the coast,—Folkestone, Dover, Deal, and the Isle of Thanet,—and again he spoke with a vigour that surprised those who had heard of the collapse which followed his preaching in the Cathedral two days before. The next day after this meeting he went up to Lambeth to be present at the discussion on the Education Bill in the House of Lords on the Thursday.¹

When he returned to Lambeth from the House of Lords, though much exhausted, he was able to join the family at dinner, and to discuss the features of the debate. He did not, however, feel well enough to leave his bed the next day. It was hoped at first that complete rest might enable him to resume his work, but as the days went by it was evident that his marvellous rallying power had at last failed him, and he remained in a condition of extreme weakness, varying from day to day.

He was much touched and gratified by a most kind and gracious letter from Queen Alexandra, who, with her usual thoughtfulness for those in sickness and suffering, had, on hearing of his serious illness, sent him a very beautiful photo-

¹ For the debate on the Education Bill see "Primacy" Memoir, pp. 380-382.—ED.

graph of herself, with a silver commemoration medal, as a memento of the Coronation.

On December 11, just a week after his speech in the House of Lords, the doctors found that there was no return of strength, but, on the contrary, indications of increasing weakness, and Mrs. Temple, according to a promise, told him the doctors' opinion ; he showed no sign of surprise or emotion, although fully conscious, and after a short time expressed a wish to receive the Holy Communion with his family and household.¹

After this he lingered on for eleven days, and then sank peacefully to rest on December 23.²

¹ The account of his last Communion is given in the "Primacy" Memoir, p. 384.—Ed.

² See *infra*, note on p. 387.—Ed.

THE PRIMACY

1896—1902

By the Right Rev. GEORGE FORREST BROWNE, D.D.

Bishop of Bristol



August 1902

F. Canstear =

In Commemoration of K. K.

CHAPTER I

THE BEGINNING

Death of Dr. Benson—The appointment of Dr. Temple—Relations between the two friends—Dr. Temple as Archbishop.

ON Sunday, October 11, 1896, Dr. Benson, the Archbishop of Canterbury, died suddenly. Dr. Temple did not hear of the death till early on Monday morning. He was completely overcome when the information reached him, but recovered himself sufficiently to read the lesson, as usual, at the family prayers in the Chapel, selecting the later verses of 1 Corinthians xv. On the evening of Thursday, October 22, he received the following letter :—

HATFIELD HOUSE, *October 22, 1896.*

MY DEAR LORD—I am authorised by Her Majesty to propose to you that you should be nominated to the Archbishopric of Canterbury, vacant by the lamented death of Archbishop Benson. I need hardly enlarge on the great office which is vacant, nor on your own pre-eminent position in the Church of England, which designates you as the fittest person to undertake it. I believe it will not involve any labours in excess of those which are now incumbent on you and to which your strength is fully equal. If you should see your way to the acceptance of the office, I am convinced all who love the Church of England will regard the event as one of singularly auspicious promise for her welfare.—Believe me, yours very truly,

SALISBURY.

The Right Rev. The Lord Bishop of London.

On the next day the Bishop sent his answer to Hatfield by the hand of his Chaplain, the Rev. G. Pownall :—

FULHAM PALACE, *October 23, 1896.*

MY DEAR LORD SALISBURY—I am very conscious of many deficiencies in my qualifications for such a post as that of the Archbishopric of Canterbury. But I believe that I could do the Church good service in that capacity, and I do not feel that I have any right to refuse the call which Her Majesty has made upon me. I will do my best to carry on the work which the late Archbishop, my most intimate friend for forty years, has been doing with such marked success. I beg of you to submit to the Queen, with my sincerest loyalty, my acceptance of Her Majesty's offer.—Believe me, yours very truly,

F. LONDON :

The Bishop's acceptance of the office was telegraphed to the Queen at Balmoral, and the matter had to be kept a profound secret until the next Sunday afternoon. The Chaplain was charged "not only not to say anything, but not even to look as if he knew something." That afternoon the Bishop wrote characteristically kind letters to his suffragans. The public announcement appeared on the Monday morning, the usual day for Lord Salisbury's announcements of that character.

At the date of his acceptance of the arduous office, Dr. Temple was within five weeks of seventy-five years of age. He was regarded as a man with a frame and constitution of iron ; but to those who had the opportunity of seeing him in private, it was clear that the toils of London had told markedly upon his reserves of strength, and that the strain could not have been kept up much longer. The change of work and position offered a relief that was greatly needed. To most men, however able mentally and strong physically, the enormous responsibility of the Primacy would in itself have been a burden heavier than the heaviest work ; but

to Dr. Temple the sense of responsibility was as the breath of his nostrils, it braced and invigorated him. As regarded physical strength, it was known to very few that until well on into middle age Dr. Temple had never been able to effect an insurance upon his life. It was often a subject of remark that as Bishop he stood to confirm and sat to give his Confirmation addresses. The reason was that the condition of his heart would not allow him to lean forward when in a sitting posture. When to this physical condition is added the hampering limitation of the muscular action of the eyes, there is something pathetically heroic in the grim, gaunt, tender-hearted man of seventy-five, entering with the quietness of strength upon the great task before him. His great predecessor Theodore was sixty-eight when he came to Canterbury, and he laboured indefatigably till he reached the age of eighty. In these modern times of longer vigour there was reason to hope for eight or ten years of a strong Primacy, although it began so late in the Primate's life.

Two tendencies, each of them natural in itself, and each possessing advantages and disadvantages, showed themselves markedly in Dr. Temple's Primacy. Some of those who were in a position to see the working out of these tendencies were of opinion that their development was on the whole not to the advantage of the highest interests of the Archbishop's unique position. These tendencies were, the isolation of a powerful mind, and the dominance of the will over physical fatigue.

During Dr. Benson's Primacy, that great prelate relied upon the judgment of the Bishop of London to an extent of which few persons were aware. The minds and characters of the two men were of such very different type, that a close concord of opinion between them seemed to be improbable.

In the Middle Ages they might have led in strife two opposing parties in the Church in time of storm and stress, while in less violent times anything like personal sympathy of man with man, and Churchman with Churchman, might have been out of the question. And yet one who knows writes thus: "They loved each other with a deep affection, and revered each other in a way that touched those deeply who saw it, and who could appreciate the meaning of it." And Dr. Benson has said that whatever sudden difficulty he was in, he could always drive over to Fulham and get counsel. But more frequently, indeed almost daily, he would send a letter stating a difficulty; the reply would be sent with unerring precision and promptness; and the episode would close with a few grateful words, "How can I sufficiently thank you for your splendid advice!" It is reported by some of those who were in the Upper House of Convocation in Dr. Benson's time, that on many occasions the Bishops wrote letters while Canterbury and London discussed *sotto voce* the business before the House. There was more point in Dr. Temple's remark on his elevation to the Primacy than even well-informed people were aware of, "I do not think I shall find the work very new."

It may be added, parenthetically, that the mutual regard of the two men, and the sense of gratitude on the part of Dr. Benson, dated back far beyond Episcopal days. When Prince Albert was concerned with the beginnings of Wellington College, he inquired whether the Headmaster of Rugby had any one on his staff who would do for the Headship of the new college. Dr. Temple replied that there was his Mr. Benson, who would do very well, and His Royal Highness might have him.

These two minds, then, however dissimilar, had been in close concert on the large affairs of the

Church, and also in comparative isolation from other minds. Their very dissimilarity made the concert of higher value to each, and to the Church. It tended also to deprive their isolation of any sense of insufficiency of counsel. When Dr. Benson was removed, there was no one left with whom Dr. Temple had been accustomed to take counsel on the greatest questions; and with his long experience, his unrivalled knowledge of the ins and outs of difficult matters, and his consciousness of adequate powers of mind, the isolation from the rest of the Bishops of the province continued. Indeed, the isolation went further than that. The "Encyclical Letter of the Bishops" at the Lambeth Conference, and the "opinion" on the question of incense, were written by himself without consultation with any one, and submitted in their complete form to his colleague or colleagues.

Of the other tendency, the dominance of the will over physical fatigue, less need be said, but not because it was in its way of less importance. The physical exertions to which the Archbishop subjected his aged frame were enough to break down a strong man many years younger. If Dr. Temple could have been persuaded to husband his reserves of physical strength, he might have been at work among us now. Instead of that, he would travel long distances, with no allowance for rest or leisure; go about when he reached his journey's end as though he had not moved from home; make an impassioned speech; take the first train back; and go straight to his work again as if he had merely passed from one room to another. The impression made upon people on each such occasion was very deep indeed, and these heroic exertions were of very great service; but his vital force, which would, if husbanded, have carried him through ten years of quieter and even more effective work, did not

hold out adequately for six years of labour of this character.

Dr. Lightfoot, when Bishop of Durham, used to say that an Archbishop of Canterbury, as the recognised spiritual head of the whole English-speaking race in communion with the Church of England throughout the world, occupied a position hardly inferior even now to that of the Pope, and destined at no distant time to be even greater. He might have added that while the Pope is controlled in all directions by the officers of the Curia and their traditions, and is saved a vast amount of personal labour by an army of secretaries and deputies, the Archbishop of Canterbury faces his work alone, and does by far the largest part of it with his own head and his own hand. He has, besides, the heavy charge of an important diocese, and the great responsibility of representing the Church of England not only as the first subject in the realm after the princes of the blood royal, but also in the legislative functions of the House of Lords. Dr. Benson said that he needed a whole college of Cardinals to help him in the work of his office.

Dr. Benson used to speak with much feeling of the anxious care which his utterances needed, on the ground that however small the occasion, his words were liable to be taken as though he spoke them after full counsel and with the authority of the united voice of the whole Church of England. That Dr. Temple felt the need of care in all he said and did as Primate cannot be reasonably doubted. But he did not—fortunately for himself—feel this need of care to be a great and anxious burden. Indeed on some few occasions, as in his published replies to letters of persons who were evidently laying traps for him, there was a general feeling that a little more of anxiety on the part of

the Primate would have been a distinct advantage to the Church.

When Dr. Temple was Bishop of London, there was an idea in many quarters that he was a man of hard, unsympathetic character. There could scarcely have been a more decided misconception; but the fault of such misconception did not lie altogether with those who formed it. In doing the business of his diocese he appeared to be working from the head alone; but much more often than men knew, the head was under the guidance of the heart.

It is probable that Dr. Temple allowed the deep kindness and tenderness of his heart to show itself, more directly than was his wont, in his personal communications with his suffragans. It would be natural to print one or two letters of this character which would surprise a large number of those who only knew the severe exterior. But about two years before his death, one of his former London suffragans had a conversation with him on the subject of publishing the letters of a deceased friend. The Archbishop's stern views on the subject were well known, and several recent examples of undue freedom of publication had served to fix him in his view. Still, it was put to him directly, in a form only verbally veiled:—"Supposing a man in a great position is believed to have had a heart of steel, and in some quarters the influence of his example has been diminished by that belief, while all the time there are those who hold evidence directly to the contrary, the production of which would greatly enhance the influence of his life?" He replied with wonted directness: "I hope no friend of mine will ever publish an intimate letter from me to him."

But, indeed, his feeling of the dignity of reticence in personal matters carried him further than that.

He used to say, when some biography was published, "I hope no one will write my life." On one occasion, when a letter came with a request for details of his early history, and a remark as to the value to the world of such details, the resident Chaplain was instructed to reply to the effect that the Archbishop "forbad all the world to write his life." It is clear that all the instincts of his nature—and no man could have a higher sense than he had of the fundamental and inviolable dignity of a man's own personality—shrank from the licence with which so many biographers write of the personal and domestic sides of the lives of men whose importance lies in their official position. Hence it is well that the publication of any intimate letters of his should be left to the devoted friend who is in the special confidence of the members of the Archbishop's family.

CHAPTER II

THE ENTHRONEMENT, ADDINGTON, ETC.

The confirmation—The day of enthronement—The Bull *Apostolicæ Curæ* and the *Responsio*—The sale of Addington—The Old Palace at Canterbury—Costly repairs at Lambeth—Transfer of the Playing Fields at Lambeth to the care of the County Council.

ON Tuesday, December 22, at the Church of St. Mary-le-Bow in Cheapside, a protest against the "Confirmation" of Dr. Temple as Archbishop of Canterbury was made by a clergyman, not beneficed, on the ground that the Archbishop elect was "a self-confessed believer in the full doctrine of evolution." Acting on legal advice, the President of the Commission (the Archbishop of York) declined to hear a protest on such ground, the occasion not being proper for an objection of that nature.¹ During the years that followed there were some unruly disturbances of the proceedings at the Confirmation of Bishops, and it fell to Dr. Temple's lot to remodel the procedure and to remove the ceremony of Confirmation to a more suitable place than a church. As early as January 27, 1897, a petition that His Grace would take steps in that direction was presented by the Church Historical Society, signed on behalf of the Society by the

¹ Dr. Temple had authorised one of his London suffragans to say to friends that he had never accepted "the full doctrine of evolution."

Bishop of Stepney (Dr. Browne), Charles Gore (now Bishop of Birmingham), and W. E. Collins (now Bishop of Gibraltar). An unexpected difficulty attended the use of the revised rules of procedure in the case of the Consecration of one of the signatories of this petition, an account of which may be given here.

The Archbishop was placed in a curious position by the events connected with the Consecration of Dr. Gore as Bishop of Worcester. An attempt was made to protest against the Confirmation, but the Vicar-General ruled that the protest could not be heard. The objectors then applied to the King's Bench for a "mandamus." It seemed that the case could not be heard before the day fixed for the Consecration of Dr. Gore and the Bishops of Likoma and Sierra Leone. The Archbishop, in talking over his own position, observed with a smile that his predicament was very awkward, for if he consecrated he would be liable to be sent to prison by the Chief Justice for contempt of court, and if he did not he would be liable to be sent to prison and to have his lands confiscated by the King under the Statute of Praemunire. As it happened, the case was heard and a rule *nisi* granted on January 24, the day before that fixed for the Consecration. The Chief Justice, however, declared that he had no power to "interfere with the Archbishop," who accordingly wished to proceed with the Consecration, fearing that otherwise, if the objectors carried their appeal to the higher courts, as they had announced their intention of doing, and the Consecration were postponed till the whole case was settled, the Diocese of Worcester might suffer greatly from the prolonged vacancy of the See. But Dr. Gore decided that he ought to wait for the decision of the King's Bench. Canon Moberly, who had been selected to preach the sermon,

brought this news to the Archbishop, and asked to be relieved of the duty of preaching the sermon at the Consecration of the other two bishops on the following day, as the sermon he had composed was written chiefly with a view to Dr. Gore's Consecration. The Archbishop released him from his engagement, and decided to preach himself, being specially desirous that no allusion should be made to the subject of the postponement of Dr. Gore's Consecration. When asked if he was not bound to fulfil the King's commands, he said, "I do not know; I shall be there to consecrate the King's man; but if the King's man does not come, I cannot help it."

Ultimately the case before the King's Bench was given against the appellants; they proceeded no further, and the Consecration was held in Lambeth Chapel on Sunday February 23, when Dr. Moberly preached the sermon.¹

The Enthronement of the Archbishop was fixed for Friday January 8, 1897. It is a double function. The Archbishop is placed in the throne of the Cathedral Church, and in the Dean's Stall, as other bishops are; but he is also placed in the Chair of St. Augustine. The enthronement and installation of an Archbishop of Canterbury are performed, as in the case of the Bishops of the Province, by the Archdeacon of Canterbury; on the mandate, in the case of a bishop, of the Archbishop of Canterbury; in the case of the Archbishop himself on the mandate of the Commissioners appointed by the Crown, namely, the Archbishop of York and several of the Bishops of the Southern Province. The mandate to the Arch-

¹ It is said that the Consecration of the Bishops of Likoma and Sierra Leone was the first occasion on which an Archbishop of Canterbury had preached a Consecration sermon for something like two centuries. The sermon in question was a purely missionary discourse. The addition of the labour of preaching to the long ceremony of Consecration, of course, involved a great physical effort.

deacon of Canterbury makes no reference to St. Augustine's Chair; it bids him "to Install and Inthroné." The Archbishop, elect and confirmed, is led by the Dean and Vice-Dean to the Archiepiscopal Throne in the Choir, and is there placed in the Throne-chair by the Archdeacon in virtue of the mandate. At a later stage the Archbishop is led out of the Choir, accompanied by the Dean and Vice-Dean, and up the south Choir aisle to the distant Trinity Chapel, where he is placed by the Archdeacon in the Chair of Purbeck marble, called St. Augustine's Chair. The whole of this last ceremony is performed out of the sight of the persons in the Choir, including the Bishops of the Province.¹ The Archbishop is then led back, and placed in the Dean's Stall by the Archdeacon.

In former times the ceremony of placing the Archbishop in the marble chair was performed in sight of all. Down to the commencement of last century, the High Altar was much further to the west than it now is. It stood upon the platform which extends from Archbishop Bouchier's tomb to that of Archbishop Stratford, and the marble chair stood on the level space where the altar now stands, above the high flight of steps now in front of the altar but then behind it. In the throne standing in this prominent position, in full sight of all, the new Archbishop was placed, and that was the ceremonial enthronement. Thus in 1695, Battely records² that the Archbishop (Dr. Tenison) "was inthronised by Mr. Archdeacon in a stone chair which is placed upon an ascent behind the Communion Table (called by the ancients

¹ At the enthronement of Dr. Temple, he was accompanied to the marble chair by the Archbishop of York and the Bishops of London, Durham, and Winchester. At the enthronement of Dr. Davidson, none of the prelates accompanied him.

² *Inventories of Christ Church, Canterbury*, by Legg and Hope, p. 282. Constable, 1902.

The Patriarchal Chair).” If it is now too late to restore the Patriarchal Chair to an eminent position, as to which opinions may differ, at least more might be made of the enthronement in it. The interests of the Church pray earnestly that it may be long before there is another Enthronement of a Primate of All England; but when, in the course of nature, such a ceremony does take place again, it seems right to suggest that the Bishops of the Province or of both Provinces should go with the Archbishop to St. Augustine’s Chair and see him seated therein. On such an occasion the due precedence of the episcopal officials of the Province should be observed. The mere existence of the offices which they hold is known to few. The fact that the Bishop of London sends out the notices for the election of Proctors in Convocation informs those who see the writs that he is Dean of the Episcopal College of the Province; and the fact that the Bishop of Salisbury says or sings the Litany at the first meeting of a new Convocation at St. Paul’s informs some at least of those present that he is Precentor of the Province, an office which he holds by reason of the care which his predecessor Osmund took in drawing up the use of Sarum, for the composing of strife over various methods of plain song. There are no special reasons why the other offices, or their holders, should be known. The full list, in order of precedence, is as follows:—London, *Dean*; Winchester, *Chancellor*; Lincoln, *Vice-Chancellor*; Salisbury, *Precentor*; Worcester, *Chaplain*; Rochester, *Cross-Bearer*.¹

¹ Boniface (Archbishop of Canterbury, 1245-73), in a Constitution promulgated by him, directed resort in a certain case to the Bishop of London *tanquam Episcoporum Decanus*. On this Lyndwood (Bishop of St. David’s, 1442-47) in his *Provinciale* dedicated to Chicheley (Archbishop of Canterbury, 1408-14) gives the gloss—Habet Archiepiscopus Cantuariensis in Collegio Episcoporum Episcopos—Londinensem Decanum, etc., as above. Lyndwood’s *Provinciale*, Oxf. 1678, Lib. III. Tit. 15, page 317.

When London is vacant, Winchester acts as Dean, and hence is sometimes called Sub-Dean : in that case Lincoln acts as Chancellor. When London and Winchester have both been vacant, Lincoln has acted as Dean.

Dr. Temple went to Canterbury the day before that fixed for the Enthronement, being most hospitably received by the Dean and Mrs. Farrar, who on all occasions offered a most gracious welcome to him and his family. He was received officially by the Corporation, and made a very genial reply to the very cordial and graceful greeting offered to him in the name of the city by the Mayor and the Recorder. He had only been in Canterbury, he said, once or twice in his life before his recent visit on the occasion of Dr. Benson's funeral. The reception which he, though not known to them, had met with, would be a great encouragement. The work of a Bishop or Archbishop was so dependent for its success upon the extent to which it conciliated good feeling and kindly support, that the warmth of their reception would be worth much to him. Dr. Benson had been a dear and intimate friend of his, and in the record of his doings he would have a line and an example to follow. He regretted very much that there was no kind of residence for the Archbishop in Canterbury. At the advanced age which he had reached he could not have many years to spend in the diocese, but he should be glad if he was able to make arrangements for being there frequently, especially at the great festivals of the Church. He believed that the work of the Church was best done by the effect of the personal influence which comes from personal contact, producing personal regard. He hoped to make the acquaintance of all, and he trusted that the spontaneous good feeling shown would grow and increase. He would endeavour to

deserve the reception they had given him, and to deserve that they should continue to regard him as they had already begun to do.

At the luncheon in the Cathedral Library, after the Enthronement, the Archbishop made a deeply moved and moving reply to an eloquent speech by the Dean, Dr. Farrar.

It was difficult, he said, not to be overwhelmed by the thought that to follow after such men as the Dean had described among the Archbishops was possible of attainment by very few. He could only say for himself what he once heard his old tutor Tait say in a Latin sermon at Oxford, *Vindicamus nobis apostolorum non honores sed labores*. However great their predecessors may have been, however impossible of imitation by their successors, there still remained the power of honest, of diligent, of earnest labour, and that it was that he should desire to claim for himself,—that forgetting all selfish ends and thinking only of God's service, he should bestow himself upon that work to the utmost of his power, and make that the leading principle of all his conduct. The one aim of any man who entered the ministry of the Church should be to make it easier for Christians to become better Christians, and for those who were not Christians to become Christians. That, to his mind, stood above every other aim that a man could have in this transitory world, to help any one to live more according to God's commandments, to help any one to feel more truly the love of the Lord Jesus Christ, to help any one to fight the battle with evil, in himself first and then in others. There were great successes and glorious successes granted by the heavenly Father to men to whom He has given the gift to attain to such. But from his soul he honoured most of all that man who, thinking nothing of the glory or the honour

of success, aimed with all his might at doing God's work as quietly, as resolutely, as perseveringly, as truly, as God had given him the power to do it. For himself, he would make it throughout his whole life, he trusted to the very end, the sole aim of his whole being to please the Lord by serving his fellow-men.

The next day, Saturday, was occupied by interviews with the candidates for Holy Orders, who were to have been ordained at the previous Advent, and by his Charge to the candidates. The Ordination was held on Sunday, January 10, in the Cathedral Church.

The Archbishop entered upon his office at a time when matters of special importance had to be taken in hand. The Pope had issued a document hostile to the validity of English Orders, and although an answer of a severely—indeed destructively—critical nature had been issued,¹ there was need for an official reply, which it was felt must run in the joint names of the two Primates. It was not work in which Dr. Temple had had much practice or experience. The completion of the sixtieth year of Queen Victoria's reign was to be the occasion of a great gathering of representatives of the Empire from all parts of the world in the month of June, and the part which the Church of England would have to play in the celebration must of necessity be large. And in July there was to be the Lambeth Conference, the invitations to which had been sent out long before by Archbishop Benson.

Important as any meeting of the Bishops from all parts of the world who are in full Communion with the Church of England must be, the Lambeth Conference of 1897 was to have this special importance, that it was called in that year instead

¹ Church History Society's Publications, No. xix.

of 1898 because 1897 was the 1300th anniversary of the arrival of Augustine for the conversion of the English.

These three occasions, superadded upon all the ordinary work of the Primacy, evidently entailed in their combination a heavy burden of thought and care, responsibility and labour.

With the inception of the *Responsio* to the Bull *Apostolicæ Curæ* of Pope Leo XIII. Dr. Temple had not anything to do. The Bull was issued early in September 1896. It was agreed that a reply should be prepared by the Bishops of Oxford (Dr. Stubbs), Salisbury (Dr. Wordsworth), and Peterborough (Dr. Creighton), and submitted to the Archbishops of Canterbury (Dr. Benson) and York (Dr. Maclagan). The draft of the Latin reply was written by the Bishop of Salisbury and sent by him to the Archbishop of Canterbury.¹ It reached him on the day of his death, and was not opened by him.

After a very short interval Dr. Temple succeeded to the Archbishopric. He threw himself with the force of his character and all the vigour of his scholarship into the consideration of the *Responsio*. He made it his business to "cut out all the thunder." The document was finally passed and signed by the two Archbishops, and was issued early in March 1897.

The concluding sentence of the *Responsio* has been called "a splendid combination of firmness and courtesy":—

To conclude, since all this has been laid before us in the name of peace and unity, we wish it to be known to all men that we are at least equally zealous in our devotion to peace and unity in the Church. We acknowledge that the things which our brother Pope Leo XIII. has written from time to

¹ See the Appendix contributed by the Bishop of Salisbury, p. 388.

time in other letters are sometimes very true and always written with a good will. For the difference and debate between us and him arises from a diverse interpretation of the self-same Gospel, which we all believe and honour as the only true one. We also gladly declare that there is much in his own person that is worthy of love and reverence. But that error, which is inveterate in the Roman Communion, of substituting the visible head for the invisible Christ, will rob his good words of any fruit of peace. Join with us then, we entreat you, most reverend brethren, in weighing patiently what Christ intended when He established the ministry of His Gospel. When this has been done, more will follow, as God wills in His own good time.

God grant that even from this controversy may grow fuller knowledge of the truth, greater patience, and a broader desire for peace in the Church of Christ, the Saviour of the world.

The only reply to the *Responsio* which the Archbishops noticed was a *Vindication* by Cardinal Vaughan and other Roman Bishops in England. In it the validity of Orders was made to depend on acceptance of the Roman doctrine of transubstantiation. The Pope had not made any direct reference to this doctrine, so the Archbishops' answer to the Roman criticism was easy. They did, however, in a few simple and dignified words expose the futility of the Cardinal's plea :—

It is, for us, simply impossible to believe it to be the will of our Lord that admission to the ministry of the Church of Christ should depend upon the acceptance of a metaphysical definition, expressed in terms of mediæval philosophy, of the mysterious gift bestowed in the Holy Eucharist; above all, when we remember that such a definition was unknown to the Church in the early ages of its history, and only publicly affirmed by the 'Church of Rome' in the thirteenth century.

It will always remain a notable mark of Dr. Temple's Primacy, that he took the bold step of selling Addington and building a residence for the Archbishops in the Cathedral precincts of their

See city. Those who have stayed for a time with Dr. Benson at Addington know how he loved the place; with what special pleasure he rode in his own park; how thoroughly he enjoyed the life of a quiet country gentleman. No one imagined that Dr. Temple would find anything like the same pleasure, in amount or in kind, in the possession of his estate in the country. Many men in official positions have to live in places they do not care about, or do not like, so long as they hold their office. When a man is offered a bishopric, he has to consider—unless he says yes by return of post, in the conviction that if he thinks it all out for a week he will say no—what the climate of the place is, and what the character of the house; or, in a very few cases, of the places and the houses. He has to take them as they are, or to leave them and decline the office. It seemed probable that Dr. Temple would at most make but little use of Addington. But the news that he was proposing to sell it came rather as a shock. Dr. Temple dealt with the question in one sentence: “I think the day is past when Archbishops of Canterbury should appear as country gentlemen,” and the fact that there were no historical or sentimental connexions between the See and Addington, a comparatively recent purchase, made it less difficult to take the drastic step of selling it. Additional surprise was caused by the statement that the Archbishop proposed to restore the Old Palace at Canterbury, and make it the second residence of the See. It was represented that an Archbishop condemned to live and labour for long months in Lambeth, not the most bracing of districts, ought to have as his second residence a place whose climate would act as a tonic. Dr. Temple replied that he did not need or care for a bracing place. It was a little difficult to argue with a man so advanced in years, that his successor

might need a bracing place; but the suggestion was made, and he replied that the Archbishop of Canterbury ought to have a residence in his archiepiscopal city and near his Cathedral Church. A bishop once asked him if he thought his successors would wish to live at Canterbury. With the grim smile which accompanied his most terse sayings he replied, "No, I don't. I want to make 'em." The Archbishop lived to see the whole plan carried out in its entirety, and to enjoy the convenience and comfort of the charming interior designed by the delicate taste and fertile brain of Mr. W. D. Caröe, the architect of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners.

Mention must be made of the exceedingly liberal way in which Dr. Temple spent money upon Lambeth Palace. Some thousands of pounds were spent on the drainage. In this matter the Archbishop took much interest, explaining to guests with great clearness the simple and effective mediæval system of drainage, which the investigations of the inspectors revealed, a system of using the daily tides to flush the sewers. The cost of doing away with this system and introducing a completely different system was naturally very serious, and, by the law of dilapidations, expenses connected with drainage fall upon the new incumbent. Later in his Primacy he determined to take in hand the exterior surface of the great pile of the Palace, the stonework being much decayed. Faulty stones were taken out and new stones were put in their place; and the whole was coated with a solution which it was hoped would render the stonework impervious to the action of the London smoke, and the chemical fumes from Doulton's factory. On this, too, some thousands of pounds were spent.

This will be a convenient occasion for mention

of the transfer of the playing-field at Lambeth to the care of the County Council. There was much to be said for the Archbishop's view, that the field required a great deal of attention always, and at that time demanded the expenditure of a considerable amount of money. If it was transferred to the care of the County Council, it would be put into perfect order as a recreation ground and playing-field, and would be carefully maintained at a much higher standard of efficiency for its special purposes than would be practically possible if it remained in the care and at the cost of the Archbishop for the time being. To set against this there was the patriarchal and local view. Ever since Archbishop Tait's time, when the complicated system of permissions to large numbers of clubs of one kind or another, to use the field for their purposes, had been brought into working order by his chaplain, the present Archbishop (Dr. Davidson), the field had been a very great boon to a large neighbourhood, and the boon came from the hands and at the cost of the Primate. If the proposed change was made, and the large alterations contemplated were carried out, it was probable that a good many of the small clubs would no longer find space for their games, and it was certain that the boon would be held to come from the County Council, no longer from the Primate. The law of possession of episcopal property enabled the Archbishop to effect the transfer for the duration of his own tenure of the office. As a matter of prudence, a large number of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners sent to the County Council a formal notice that any future Archbishop could, at pleasure, re-enter upon the possession of the field, with all improvements effected by the Council.

The park, which contains an area of nearly ten acres, was opened on Thursday, October 24, 1901,

after being laid out by the London County Council. It had been divided into two enclosures, one being reserved, at the instance of Mrs. Temple, for women and children. The agreement by which the Archbishop handed it over to the Council was made terminable at three months' notice, and the Archbishop had stipulated that no public meetings should be held in the park. At the opening, the Archbishop said that in his judgment there was nothing better worth supplying to the people, next to the ministrations of religion, than these open spaces for recreation grounds. He had long cherished the idea of handing it over to the people, but had been told that it could not be done without an Act of Parliament, which was a troublesome undertaking. He was, therefore, very glad to find, when approached by Colonel Ford, that it was possible to do it simply by an agreement between himself and the County Council. The Chairman of the Council (Mr. A. M. Torrance) and the Chairman of the Parks Committee (Lord Monkswell) proposed and seconded a hearty vote of thanks to the Archbishop.

The day of the opening of the park at Lambeth was marked by another striking scene. The Archbishop went down to the People's Palace in Mile-End Road to address working-men. He received a great ovation, crowds of the men pressing up on to the platform to shake hands with him, always made a great point of in the East End. The Archbishop's speech was on "Christianity and Imperialism," a subject which lent itself to his passionate insistence on the duty of every man to see and live up to his high calling for God and for his country.

CHAPTER III

THE LAMBETH CONFERENCE

Queen Victoria's Diamond Jubilee—The fourth Lambeth Conference, 1897 — Ebbs Fleet — Arrangements for the sessions at Lambeth Palace—Archbishop Temple's conduct of the Conference.—The Encyclical Letter—The Service of Dismissal in St Paul's—Meeting at Glastonbury.

ON Sunday, June 21, 1897, the Archbishop attended in state the great Service of Thanksgiving held at St. Paul's in commemoration of the sixtieth year of Her Majesty's reign. A very large number of Royal personages were present, no less than thirty members of reigning families being seated in front of the choir gates. With the Archbishop was the Archbishop of Finland, deputed by the Holy Synod of Russia to represent the Orthodox Church at the Jubilee ceremonies. The sermon was preached by the Bishop of London (Dr. Creighton). The Prince and Princess of Wales remained for the celebration of the Holy Eucharist, not communicating.

On the following Tuesday the Archbishop was the principal figure in the reception of Her Majesty at the west front of St. Paul's. It would be out of place to give any description here of that most remarkable occasion. The *Te Deum* was sung to Sir George Martin's noble setting. The Dean, Canons, and Minor Canons sang "O Lord save the Queen." The Dean (Dr. Gregory) said the first

words of the Lord's Prayer, which was immediately taken up by the vast assemblage which filled the churchyard. The Bishop of London (Dr. Creighton) read the special prayer written by the Archbishop. The Archbishop then gave the Benediction, with a voice that reached every one. Finally, with an effect that can never be forgotten by any one who was present, the thousands that filled every available place in the churchyard, every window, every roof, as far as eye could reach, sang with tremendous force "All people that on earth do dwell." Then came a silence. There was a delay somewhere. The Queen's carriage did not move. The explanation was evident to those who occupied posts of vantage. The carriages (seventeen) which contained the Princesses had to move off before the Queen's carriage could move. There would be an appreciable time during which no one would know what to do. But the Primate knew. "Three cheers for the Queen!" he cried. Needless to say it was taken up, and carried on, and the threatened hiatus was filled in a way that brought the tears coursing down the cheeks of the dearly loved and venerable Queen.

The great gathering of nearly 200 bishops of the Anglican Communion at the Lambeth Conference of 1897 would in itself have been a mark of distinction in any Primacy. It was the fourth of these remarkable gatherings. They took their beginning from the interest felt by one province of Colonial churches in the affairs of another Colonial province. It was the Provincial Synod of the Canadian Church, stirred by the state of affairs in the Church in South Africa, and moved by the Bishop of Ontario (Dr. Lewis, who was present at the Conference in 1897), that first took a step in the direction of a General Council of the Anglican Communion. This first step was a Resolution

unanimously agreed to by the Provincial Synod on September 20, 1865, that the Archbishop of Canterbury (Dr. Longley) should be urged to summon such an assembly. Out of 144 bishops invited, 76 in all attended the Conference in 1867, six English prelates feeling such grave doubts as to the propriety and wisdom of the step taken by Dr. Longley that they declined to attend the Conference.

For the Conference of 1878, 108 bishops accepted the invitation of the Archbishop (Dr. Tait), but eight were prevented from attending, and the number present was exactly 100. For the third Conference in 1888, 211 were invited by the Archbishop (Dr. Benson) and 145 attended. For the Conference of 1897 Dr. Benson had invited about 240, and of those 197 attended. The steady and large growth of the number of bishops in attendance is only less remarkable than the exceedingly rapid rate at which bishoprics of the Anglican Communion were being created in various parts of the world.

On Wednesday, June 30, there was a Quiet Day at Lambeth, to which all the bishops attending the Conference were invited.

On Friday, July 2, the Archbishop and the members of the Conference proceeded by special train to Ebbs Fleet, to hold a solemn service at the traditional place of landing of Augustine and his band of forty monks in the year 597. The service was held near the memorial cross erected on the traditional spot by the late Lord Granville. It may be well to state here the main facts of this great cross, in order that they may be permanently preserved. It is, in its general form and plan, a skilful reproduction; though on a smaller scale, of the remarkable Anglican crosses in the market-place at Sandbach in Cheshire. A large number of

appropriate subjects, very carefully chosen, are represented on the four faces of the shaft and on the head of the cross, and the base bears a Latin inscription written by Dean Liddell, once Lord Granville's tutor. The English translation, authorised by Dean Liddell, is as follows :—

Augustine, at length brought to Ebbs Fleet in the Isle of Thanet after so many labours on land and at sea, at a conference with King Ethelbert on this spot, delivered his first discourse to our people and auspiciously founded the Christian faith, which was diffused with wonderful rapidity throughout the whole of England. A.D. 596.

In order that the memory of these events may be preserved among the English people, Granville George Leveson Gower, Earl Granville, Lord Warden of the Cinque Ports, has caused this monument to be erected A.D. 1884.

The *mira celeritate* of the late Dean is a rather rhetorical way of representing the facts of the very slow spread of Christianity beyond Kent. The cross and its site have since been conveyed from Lord Granville's trustees to the trustees of Richborough Castle, of whom the Archbishop of Canterbury for the time being is the chief.

After the service, the large party of archbishops, bishops, clergy, and laity proceeded to the great enclosure called Richborough Castle, with its unrivalled Roman walls, and there were received by the Mayor and Corporation of Sandwich.

On the next day, Saturday, the bishops present attended the inaugural service at the Cathedral Church of Canterbury. The Archbishop delivered an allocution from the Chair of Augustine, which had been moved from the Corona to the Sacarium for the occasion. On Monday, July 5, the Holy Communion was celebrated at Westminster Abbey at 9 A.M., and at 11 A.M. the first session of the Conference was held at Lambeth. It was found that great care had been taken for the convenience

and comfort of the members. Each bishop had his own arm-chair, with useful adjuncts for making notes; the chairs were arranged in deep rows, facing one another on either side of a central space down the middle of the Guard Room. This arrangement worked excellently well in practice, and it can scarcely be improved upon. The provision of lockers for all the bishops in another part of the palace, places marked with their names for coats, etc., long lines of tables for luncheon in broad passages, and many other arrangements to which the best thought of a practical mind had been given, had the effect of making the whole machinery of the sessions of the Conference work to the end in a most orderly, convenient, and comfortable manner. These arrangements, to which the Archbishop himself had given much attention, were made under the skilful superintendence of Mr. W. D. Caröe, the architect of the Ecclesiastical Commission. All of the metropolitans, and all of the bishops from the United States of America, were invited in turn to stay for some days at Lambeth. The house-party numbered as a rule about twenty-two, from Mondays to Wednesdays, and from Wednesdays to Saturdays. The Archbishop kept the Sundays as days of rest.

It would clearly be out of place to use this opportunity by giving a history of the Conference. But it is equally clear that something must be said of the personal part which the Archbishop himself played.

No one had doubted that he would by his great personality hold the Conference together as an admirable chairman. But it was very soon apparent that he was to do and to be much more than that. There need be no hesitation in saying that the death of Dr. Benson had been held to be a great blow to the prospects of the Lambeth Conference.

That prelate was ideally fitted to act as president of such a gathering. To him the distant bishops throughout the world had for years turned for sympathy and advice. With him many of them had been in intimate correspondence. He knew their needs, their hopes, their fears. To the American bishops he was a *persona gratissima*, and there can be no doubt that they came to the Conference with a sense that its highest personal attraction had passed away. They went back to America full not only of the greatest reverence for Dr. Temple, but also of the warmest personal affection for him. Ample testimony to the growth of this feeling was given at Lambeth itself; but as if to leave no doubt about the matter, a beautiful present came across the Atlantic, some time after their return, in the form of vessels for private Communion, of gold, exquisitely designed and richly jewelled. To add to the interest of this gift, the execution of the work had been entrusted to one who had been a pupil of Dr. Temple at Rugby. The following inscription was placed on the case:—

F. CANTUAR.

ARCHBISHOP PRIMATE METROPOLITAN

presiding over the

Lambeth Conference of 1897

in the spirit of power and of love and of a sound mind
from his brothers in the American Episcopate
an affectionate recognition of his wise leadership
his justice his generosity his gracious hospitality.

The Archbishop acknowledged the gift in the following letter:—

LAMBETH PALACE, *December 8, 1897.*

MY DEAR BISHOP OF ALBANY—It is not easy to express the gratitude and pleasure with which I received by the hands of the Bishop of Rochester the beautiful present which my

brothers in the United States have kindly sent me as a memorial of the happy days we spent together in our Lambeth Conference this year. The whole time was to me a blessing; for every day seemed to draw us closer together and deepen our sense of the greatness of the work with which we are entrusted by our Lord and Master.

And what kindness, what hearty co-operation, what ready tolerance, what generous sympathy, I myself met with from every one present, I shall never forget as long as I live.

Your wonderfully beautiful gift speaks and will ever speak to my heart. The givers can never be absent from my prayers. The thoughtfulness shown in every minute detail tells me that it is the offering of genuine loving-kindness. I shall treasure it while I live, and shall leave it to my successor as an undying token of the strong tie of affection that binds our two branches of the Church of Christ in the closest and most loving union.

Will you be so very good as to convey to my brothers my heartfelt thanks for their kindness; and believe me, your most affectionate brother in Christ, F. CANTUAR.

The summary of the resolutions arrived at by the Conference, called the Encyclical Letter, was drafted entirely by himself in the course of a night, without consultation with any one. With but slight exceptions it was adopted, and appears as the published letter. It began characteristically with the subject "Temperance," proceeded next to "Purity," and thence to "Sanctity of Marriage." In each case the draft was closely compressed and went on broad principles. A short extract from each may be given. Of temperance he wrote, "It is important to lay stress on the essential condition of permanent success in this work, namely, that it should be taken up in a religious spirit as part of Christian devotion to the Lord." Of purity, "The sin of impurity is a degradation to those who fall into it, whether men or women, and purity is within reach of every Christian who, trusting in the grace of God, fights the battle of his baptismal vow." Of marriage, "The mainten-

ance of the dignity and sanctity of marriage lies at the root of social purity, and therefore of the safety and sacredness of the family and the home. The foundation of its holy security and honour is the precept of our Lord,¹ 'What therefore God hath joined together let not man put asunder.'"

It is interesting to note, having regard to the important "hearings" on Incense and Reservation which some time after followed, that, in the course of discussion at the Conference, the Archbishop insisted upon the great practical value of the provision that for the resolution of doubts as to the manner of understanding, doing, or executing the things contained in the Book of Common Prayer, the doubt should be taken to the Bishop of the Diocese, and if he doubted then to the Archbishop. Dr. Benson had in his time pressed this point. Another subject on which Dr. Temple had a strong view was the question between the broad and the restricted interpretation of the words of the Act of Uniformity Amendment Act with regard to special forms of service approved by the Ordinary: "So that there be not introduced into such service anything, except anthems or hymns, which does not form part of the Holy Scriptures or Book of Common Prayer." He maintained firmly the broad interpretation, namely, that it sufficed that nothing should be introduced that was not in harmony with the spirit of the Book of Common Prayer. This refusal to be bound by the letter of the law, the wide meaning of inclusion attached to the words "form part of," seemed not consistent with the Archbishop's insistence on the exclusive force of the letter in cases where the letter was at least not more conclusive than here. On this and

¹ It appears to be right to add, that, firm as Dr. Temple was on the sanctity of marriage, his views on the position of the "innocent party" did not satisfy those who take the gravest view.

on other accounts two of his paragraphs in the Encyclical Letter on the Book of Common Prayer may fitly be quoted here :—

The Book of Common Prayer, next to the Bible itself, is the authoritative standard of the doctrine of the Anglican Communion. The great doctrines of the Faith are there clearly set forth in their true relative proportion. And we hold that it would be most dangerous to tamper with its teaching either by narrowing the breadth of its comprehension, or by disturbing the balance of its doctrine. We do not speak of any omission or modification which might have the effect of practically denying an article in one of the Creeds, for that would be not only dangerous but a direct betrayal of the Faith. Nevertheless, it is true that no Book can supply every possible need of worshippers in every variation of local circumstances. We therefore think it our duty to affirm the right of every Bishop, within the jurisdiction assigned to him by the Church, to set forth or to sanction additional services and prayers when he believes that God's work may be thereby furthered, or the spiritual needs of the worshippers more fully met, and to adapt the prayers already in the Book to the special requirements of his own people. But we hold that this power must always be subject to any limitations imposed by the provincial or other lawful authority, and the utmost care must be taken that all such additions or adaptations be in thorough harmony with the spirit and tenor of the whole Book.

Difficulties having arisen in some quarters with regard to the administration of Holy Communion to the sick, we recommend that such difficulties should be left to be dealt with by the Bishop of each Diocese in accordance with the direction contained in the preface to the Book of Common Prayer 'Concerning the Services of the Church.'

A great Service of Dismissal was held at St. Paul's on Sunday August 1, at which the Archbishop preached the sermon.

Taking his text from Acts i. 8, "Ye shall receive power from on high," the Archbishop dwelt upon the theme which had formed the subject of some of his most stirring addresses to the Conference, one, especially, the recollection of which

will not pass away from the mind of any that heard it. The Christian, he told the vast congregation at St. Paul's, who had learned to know something of the marvellous love of Christ, could not but feel the earnest desire to give to others that which was so deep a blessing to himself. A man was but half a Christian who was content to receive what the Lord so graciously gave to him, and had no thought or care for the many of those for whom Christ died who had not even heard the name of Christ. The Church had been slumbering in this matter. It had been taken up by devoted men, and by associations of devoted men; but, as a body, the Church had left it quite alone. It was time for the Church to awaken to the fulness of that which the Lord required of her. It was the Lord that called on the Church; let the Church follow that call.

Many of those who heard this impassioned address no doubt realised that it was yet another example of the perseverance and persistence of the Archbishop. In deference to the wish of the Conference he had toned down his remarks on the neglect of the Church, as a body, in the matter of missions. His sermon was his own, and there was no toning down there.

This persistence endured to the end. The last sermon of his life was on Foreign Missions, as—by striking coincidences—the last completed speech of his life was on temperance, and the last words he uttered in public were on education. The sermon referred to, the last of his life, was preached in Canterbury Cathedral on Sunday, November 30, his eighty-first birthday. “Woe is unto me,” was the text, “if I preach not the Gospel.”

Two characteristic utterances of the Archbishop at the Conference may be mentioned here. Without some such illustration, no one who was not

present can form an idea of the quaintly unconventional vigour of Dr. Temple's presidency.

On one occasion a debate had dragged itself out to its close. One of the most important Bishops rose and said that he wished before the discussion ended to make one remark ; he felt sure it would not prolong the discussion, which had already occupied quite sufficient time. It turned out that the Bishop's remark stirred up more than one speaker, and led to a considerable consumption of valuable time. When at length the Archbishop brought the debate to its final close, he observed, "Bishop of —, next time you don't want others to talk, keep your own mouth shut." As an illustration of this frankness, an example may be given from another occasion, not at the Conference. A bishop who was speaking found himself at variance with his audience, composed of his Episcopal brethren. He felt sure that they must be in agreement with him, not at variance, and in a puzzled way he repeated his remark, but still with the same unsatisfactory result. The Archbishop, in the chair, came to his assistance with the trenchant utterance, "Bishop of —, what you mean is all right, but what you say isn't what you mean." He had accurately diagnosed the difficulty.

The other example came about in this way. The Archbishop was reading to the assembled bishops the draft which he had prepared for the summary of the resolutions of the Conference, to be published as the "Encyclical Letter from the Archbishops, Bishops Metropolitan, and other Bishops of the Holy Catholic Church in full communion with the Church of England." He had used very strong language about the negligence of the Church of England in the matter of missionary work among the heathen and in foreign parts. More

than one bishop begged that the severe phrases of censure might be seriously moderated, to bring them within cover of what those who spoke believed to be the real facts. The Archbishop declined to change the phrases. The objectors persisted, going so far as to declare that the expressions used were unjust, and would greatly grieve the keen supporters of missions without having any useful effect upon such as were negligent. Still the Archbishop declined to change, and after a time the session came to its appointed end.

The next morning the Archbishop commenced the proceedings by announcing that he proposed to modify the phrases objected to, although for his own part he thought them not too strong. He then read the passage in the form in which it appears in the published encyclical letter. A leading American Bishop sprang up and began to thank the Archbishop warmly for acceding to the wishes expressed the evening before. The Bishop's words were interrupted by a stern pronouncement from the President's chair,—“Bishop of ———, you may thank me as much as you like ; but you must thank me in silence.”

It is a curious fact, known probably to very few, told to the writer by the Archbishop himself when he was Bishop of London, that a similar remark was once made to himself. When he went up to Oxford from Rugby to read his thesis for the degree of Doctor in Divinity, he took with him a bundle of the boys' exercises to occupy the hour of the thesis, if, as he was given to understand was usual, no one came to hear it. He arrived at the appointed place ; there was no one there ; he set to work upon the exercises. Suddenly a door opened and a Master of Arts came in, followed by eighteen or twenty undergraduates, who proceeded to seat themselves. The Master rose and prepared

to read his thesis ; but the Master of Arts explained to him that he was an examiner who could not find any other room than this for the *viva voce* examination of a number of undergraduates for some pass examination. Mr. Temple replied that the room was assigned to him for the reading of his thesis, and since there were members of the University present, read it he must. After trying in vain to persuade him to take another view, the Master of Arts delighted him by the quaint suggestion—"Can you not deliver it in silence, while we go on with our *viva voce*?" And this he did!

On Tuesday, August 3, the Archbishop and more than a hundred of the bishops who had attended the Lambeth Conference proceeded by special train to Glastonbury, "the cradle of British Christianity." There a noble ceremonial had been organised by the Bishop of Bath and Wells (Dr. Kennion), to whom the whole Church owes a deep debt of gratitude. The main purpose was that in the 1300th year from the coming of Augustine to convert the English to Christianity, the whole Anglican Communion at home and abroad should make special pilgrimage to a site intimately connected with the much earlier Christianity of the British races, whom the pagan Saxons and Angles drove out of their lands.

The Archbishop and bishops robed in St. John's Church, and the clergy (560 in number) in St. Benedict's Church and the schools of the two parishes. The choir numbered 150. The procession to the Abbey ruins was headed by the Mayor, in robes, and the Corporation. The day was magnificently fine, but the blazing heat of the sun was almost unbearable. When the Archbishop emerged at the end of the procession into the full light of the sun, he was urged to place some

covering on his head, as almost every one else was forced of necessity to do, "No," he said, with characteristic energy of utterance, "No; my skull is thicker than yours!" It would be difficult to imagine anything of the kind more beautiful than the long procession, of which no one could see the two ends at the same time, moving in its many coloured robes and hoods across the great grass lawns at the east of the ruins, kept in such exquisite order by Mr. Stanley Austin, the owner of the historic site. The long line wound round the ruins on the south side, then turned and passed up the centre of what was once the nave, and so on to the great choir where seats were arranged for all, the brilliant sky being the only covering. The effect of the service, impressive enough in itself, was infinitely enhanced by the memories that clung to the ancient walls, in parts so picturesque in their ruin, in parts so sound in their massive strength. The address was given by the Bishop of Stepney (Dr. Browne). After the address, the Bishop of Albany (Dr. Doane) read a message from the Presiding Bishop of the Church in the United States of America; then the *Magnificat*, the Archbishop's Benediction, and the *Nunc Dimittis*.¹

¹ A full account of the proceedings is given in No. XXX. of the publications of the Church Historical Society, under the title "Glastonbury."

CHAPTER IV

OFFICIAL VISITS TO SCOTLAND

Visit to the General Assembly (1898)—Temperance reception—
Attendance at the annual meeting of the Scottish Threefold
Option Alliance in the Masonic Hall—Visit to Perth and
the Episcopal Church in Scotland (1902).

FEW events of Dr. Temple's primacy were more striking in themselves, or farther reaching in the impression they made, than his visit to the venerable General Assembly of the National Church of Scotland. The invitation came from Dr. James Paton, of St. Paul's, Glasgow, the Convener of the Committee on Temperance, who has most kindly communicated the detailed information on which this account of the visit is based. The Archbishop's note in reply was, of course, brief, prompt, and highly characteristic: he would come to Edinburgh in May, and would address the General Assembly on the day on which Dr. Paton gave in the Committee's Report on Temperance.

The Archbishop arrived in Edinburgh on the evening of Thursday May 26, 1898, and was received at the Balmoral Hotel by his host the Right Reverend the Moderator of the General Assembly, Dr. Leishman of Linton. The next morning about two hundred and fifty leading persons met His Grace at breakfast by special invitation. On leaving the hotel, Dr. Temple pro-

ceeded to the place where the Committee on Temperance and a large number of their friends had just finished the annual breakfast under the presidency of Dr. Paton. There he made a short and rousing speech, beginning with a well-deserved and not wholly original national compliment, ‘a breakfast in Scotland seemed to him better than a breakfast anywhere else in the world.’ He assured those present that as they were the members of the Church Temperance Association, his heart was with them in all the work they undertook. Then he broke out into a stern denunciation of the sin of indifference in regard to the terrible results of intemperance. Indifference in the presence of the notorious facts was the very antipodes of all true Christian sentiment.

There is one course which I beg of you as Christians not to take; and that is, to be indifferent. For any Christian to look on and say that he has nothing to do with it, stirs my strongest indignation. My friends! my friends! let us sink it into our very souls that we have no right to be indifferent in such a cause!

Thence the Archbishop went to Holyrood Palace, where the Lord High Commissioner to the Church of Scotland, the Earl of Leven and Melville, was holding semi-Royal State during the sittings of the General Assembly. After the presentation, Dr. Temple drove with the Lord High Commissioner in the procession to the Assembly Hall, where he sat in the Throne Gallery on the right hand, of Lord Leven during the constitution of the Assembly and the opening service. The attendance, as was only natural, was abnormally large. The galleries and corridors were crowded with people, who, in the phrase of the accurate Scottish logic, “stood through the whole sederunt.” Dr. Paton formally presented the report,

and then gave way to Dr. Temple, whom he felicitously described as the most distinguished living representative of the famous Church of England, a minister of Christ who had ennobled a great and gracious career by his courageous and unwearied and impassioned defence of the greatest of all modern social reforms, the cause of temperance. The Archbishop was then led down by the Principal Clerk from the Throne Gallery to the floor of the House, the whole of the vast audience rising to their feet and receiving him with overwhelming cheers.

Dr. Paton describes his address as one of the most direct, practical, and impassioned addresses ever heard within those walls; free from all attempt at rhetorical flourishes of any kind; leaving the indelible conviction that a truly Apostolic minister had spoken, and spoken in the power of the Spirit of God. The speech was printed by the Committee, with a full and interesting account of the proceedings in the Assembly Hall and at the Threefold-Option meeting which followed in the Masonic Hall.¹

The summary statement of the main points and features of the speech, which Dr. Paton has kindly been at the pains to make, shows the vividness of the impression left by it.

The dominant note was of high hopefulness. The movement was going perpetually forward. It had never receded. The progress might be slow, but there was always some progress. The root of the work was the precept of our Lord: "Love one another," and that could never fail! On the one hand, he denounced indifference; as failing to follow the steps of the Lord; and on the other hand, he vindicated the principle of Christian

¹ This report, price one penny, can probably still be obtained on application to the Organising Secretary, 22 Queen Street, Edinburgh.

liberty. He described the work of the Church of England Temperance Society, in each of the thirty-five dioceses, with a total staff of eighty-five temperance evangelists and thousands of helpers all pledged to do what they can, and persisting in doing it. He called for the assistance of the Legislature to remove a great many of the temptations continually overpowering the weak, and continually increasing the number of those who fall. He showed the use and value of total abstinence, especially to those for whom it is really impossible to walk in sober ways unless they cut the temptation clean off as the Lord Himself commanded. He reminded them that such work is not to be done only or mainly by speakers—"You cannot do much in this cause except by personal labour. Without that, all attempts at work are poor and meagre."

He turned then to the clergy of the Scottish Church, and declared that only in proportion as they took up this cause, and personally proved their devotion to it by the manner of their own living, would the effect of all they did show itself as a gift of God's own governance; and he urgently repeated that without such personal devotion the cause could not win. He particularly appealed to those who do not think it their duty to become abstainers themselves, to show by their zeal, by their earnestness for temperance, by their own action in restraining their own indulgence, that they really do care about the cause. He showed how these friends can very decidedly help, as far as legislation is concerned, even more than abstainers can; and then fervently added, "I, for my part, am free to confess that if I cannot get a man's conscience with me, I had rather not have the man with me at all; but, if he is really in earnest to help, a man will readily find means of proving it."

In closing, the Archbishop very warmly expressed his appreciation of the "extraordinary kindness" with which he had been received; and in apology for the time he had occupied, protested, "For my part, I feel the call to this great work through my very heart and soul!" While again recognising the full liberty of Christian conscience in every man that lives, he still dared to plead that every one should join in helping this cause; not being so foolish as to object "I am only one," so foolish as "to be thinking so much about themselves at all"; but to do it "for the sake of Christ who died for us, and who calls us to live for Him. Be ready to make every sacrifice that may come in your path for your fellow-creatures; and do it that you may be more like the blessed Lord that died upon the Cross!"

The Leader of the House, Dr. Scott of Edinburgh, and Lord Balfour of Burleigh, proposed and seconded a resolution of thanks, calling upon the Moderator to express to the Archbishop the gratitude of the General Assembly. This the Moderator proceeded to do in very happy terms, touching in his concluding remarks upon the relation of the National Churches of England and Scotland. He remarked in this connexion that it was "impossible for them to forget that the advocate of Social Reform, to whom they had been listening, was the greatest ecclesiastic in the kingdom; and that this was the first time the General Assembly ever had the honour of receiving the Head of the Great Anglican Church." If they must "still move on parallel lines, with the dividing space broader than they could wish, they could at least pray and hope that the force of spiritual attraction was bringing them nearer; and one of the stages of approach was accomplished when the Primate of all England came to the General

Assembly of the Church of Scotland to give it the benefit of his experienced counsel, and was welcomed with the profound respect due to a father in God, a brother in Christ."

The Archbishop, in his reply, said that he would rather reverse the position, feeling that the honour had been paid to him and to the Church of England in his being invited on such an occasion and for such a purpose—an honour he would remember to the day of his death; believing in his heart, as he truly did, that the difference between the Churches, after all, does not keep apart the Christian love, and the deep Christian sympathy, which ought to unite together all those who hold the Faith as it is revealed in the Holy Word of God. "My heart is with you, and will remain with you always."

After leaving the General Assembly, amidst fresh manifestations of every mark of affection and esteem from all present, and from the great crowds around the doors, the Archbishop attended the Second Annual Meeting of the Scottish Three-fold-Option Alliance in the Masonic Hall, where also there was a crowded and enthusiastic audience. Sir John N. Cuthbertson, LL.D., of Glasgow, occupied the chair and introduced the Archbishop, who turned at once to discuss "the particular method that is proposed by this Alliance of Scotsmen for legislating in the matter of Temperance Reform." He vindicated the "absolute necessity of seeking the help of the Legislature to diminish these temptations to excess," it being "too dreadful to think that many poor, struggling, and really penitent victims, who earnestly desire to be set free, are actually barred from repentance because their countrymen allow all these terrible allurements to be set beside their path."

He emphasised the necessity, also, of carrying the people themselves largely with them in any

licensing proposals, and thence the conviction that they should throw upon the people—the electorate—the responsibility of saying whether they would have these temptations amongst them at all; and, if so, under what limitations and conditions. He proceeded to show that the choice offered to the electorate must be a real choice, and not simply one course with yes or no; it must contain several options which they might consider, one or other of which they might decide upon as being best for their particular locality.

He had read the 'Threefold-Option Bill with a good deal of attention. "It seems to me an exceedingly good attempt to deal with the problem before us. It submits three options to the electorate; an option for reduction in the number of licences to a statutory maximum; an option for the prohibition of the traffic in a locality with certain specified exceptions as to hotels, etc.; and an option for the public management of the traffic, under wise and statutory conditions, for the welfare of the community, and no longer for private gain." With this variety of options he emphatically agreed, and he added, "I certainly will pledge myself to this, that if it goes to the House of Lords I will support it there with all my power." He hoped that it might become law as soon as possible. But he warned them that, if they were not willing to persevere again and again, they could not succeed. "If you do not move in the name of God, and because you are taking up God's cause, you cannot win—you cannot win! I beg you to take this for your perpetual principle—that you will persevere to the last."

The Master of Polwarth proposed, and Sir Mark Stewart, M.P., seconded a vote of thanks; after which His Grace lunched with the Moderator, and left Edinburgh for London at 2.20 P.M.,

having only arrived from London on the previous night.

Thus happily, Dr. Paton says, closed an episode that appealed at once to the imagination and the heart of the Scottish people as few events have done during the past generation. The Archbishop was extremely gratified at the reception everywhere accorded to him, and repeatedly assured the Convener, at whose appeal he had come to Scotland, that it was "one of the most perfectly delightful days he had ever spent in the cause of temperance reform." There are not many men of seventy-six years and a half who could fit into thirty-six hours the double journey between London and Edinburgh, a night's rest, and all the giving forth of electrical sympathy which this visit to Scotland involved.

The Archbishop's visit to the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland in 1898 was not his only official visit to Scotland. Four years later, when he was within four months of eighty years of age, he went still farther north, to Perth, and there took part in an interesting function of the Episcopal Church in Scotland. The occasion was the dedication of the new Chapter House added to St. Ninian's Cathedral Church in memory of Charles Wordsworth, for forty years Bishop of the united Dioceses of St. Andrews, Dunkeld, and Dunblane, and for some years prior to 1854 Warden of Trinity College, Glenalmond. Dr. Wilkinson, formerly Bishop of Truro, who had succeeded Bishop Wordsworth in 1893, invited his former neighbour in the south-west to visit Perth, and preach at the Dedication on July 31, 1902. The Marquis of Salisbury, at the Archbishop's request, most kindly put off a debate in the House of Lords, to enable His Grace to keep his Scottish appointment. The Bishop of St. Andrews rented at that time Pitfour Castle, six miles out of Perth, but the Archbishop elected

to stay with Dr. Rorison, the Dean of St. Andrews and Provost of St. Ninian's, in order to avoid the six miles' drive at the end of so many hours of railway travelling, and before the early service the next morning.

The day's work on the 31st was hard enough for so old a man after so long a journey, to be followed by the return journey the next day. The Archbishop was present at the Holy Communion at 8 A.M., preached in the forenoon, appeared and spoke at luncheon in the Deanery, held a reception in the County Buildings in the afternoon, when he shook hands with hundreds of people, and in the evening attended Evensong at the Cathedral Church, followed by a sermon by the Bishop of Salisbury, the nephew of Bishop Charles Wordsworth. The Dean remarked that the Archbishop appeared to take most interest in a merry little pair of twin boys, Alasdair and Adrian Kinloch, sons of the Chapter Clerk, who acted as his train-bearers. The Archbishop was delighted with them.¹ At the reception, he rose to shake hands with every lady who was presented to him. His host, moved thereto by one who knew and had a right to speak, ventured to suggest that he should not get up, but bow as he sat. This only made him more energetic in his politeness.

"All that he said, both in preaching and in speaking, was kind and wise and holy. But it was the great presence of the Archbishop, splendid in extreme old age, his venerable and kingly mien, his beautiful old-fashioned courtesy, that made the deepest and most lasting impression."

¹ These two twin brothers were killed in the railway accident at Cudworth on January 19, 1905, on their way to Bradfield School. They had always before gone by the other route, but on this occasion decided that they would try the Midland route for a change.

CHAPTER V

CONTROVERSY

Primary Visitation Charge, 1898—Questions of ritual, and doctrine, and discipline—The opinion of the Archbishops on incense—Lay deputation of protest—The Archbishop's opinion on the reservation of the Blessed Sacrament.

IN the summer of 1898 Sir William Harcourt wrote a series of letters to the *Times*, in which he made very strong comments upon the growth—unchecked, as it appeared to him—of ritualistic practices. The Archbishop took no public notice of these letters. His general policy was not to enter into any controversy in the press, and not to correct misrepresentations. He acted on the principle of waiting for an opportunity of his own selection to deal with the subject in a complete manner.

The Visitation Charge of October 1898 was the only reply the Archbishop made to Sir William Harcourt. In it he expressed his own personal opinion clearly and concisely on two main points raised by the political controversialist. The practice of Confession, he declared, tended to weaken character. As regarded variety of ritual, he maintained, "it is unity of ceremonial that makes possible the toleration of diversity of opinion." This is not the place to discuss the correctness of these views.

The Charge naturally dealt with some burning questions, such as the uneasiness in the Church, the doctrine of the Holy Eucharist, improper objects of Worship, and Prayers for the Dead. Under the second of these heads the Archbishop quoted the words of Mr. Bennett, of Frome, on the Real Presence, which the Privy Council refused to condemn, and said this :—

It is not possible really to distinguish between this doctrine and the doctrine commonly called “Consubstantiation”; and it is important that it should be clearly understood that it is not unlawful to hold it and to teach it within the Church of England. Up to this point the Church of England, in fact, leaves the question open.

This of necessity caused some discussion, and six or seven months later a hope was addressed to him that he might “see his way to declare that the doctrine of Consubstantiation cannot properly be held in the Church of England, and ought not to be taught by her clergy.” There does not appear to be any public record of a reply from his Grace. A reply of a satisfactory nature would have been difficult, considering the statement to which he had committed himself.

Considerable discussion was caused by an answer sent by the Archbishop to an individual who had asked him to grant a dispensation to total abstinents to receive in one kind. The answer was published by the Archbishop’s correspondent with a remark to the effect that it appeared to be possible to meet the case by reducing the alcoholic strength of the chalice so as not to exceed that of many temperance beverages. To any such dilution as this, very natural objection was raised. The letter itself was as follows :—

LAMBETH PALACE, S.E.,
May 6, 1898.

MY DEAR SIR—In reply to your letter of 5th inst. I am desired by the Archbishop of Canterbury to say that this matter has been carefully considered by the Bishops, and that, though they could not consent to sanction the administration of the Holy Communion in one kind only, they know nothing to prevent the dilution of the wine with water before it is brought into the church to whatever extent may be necessary.

F. HALSEY (Chaplain).

It will be seen by the dates that any consideration by the bishops of the amount of dilution possible must have been on some previous occasion, and some at least of the bishops were unaware of any such discussion. The Archbishop's reply must not be regarded as expressing any approach to such an opinion as that which his correspondent discovered in it.

In the autumn of 1898 a gentleman wrote to the Archbishop to complain that in one of the churches in the Diocese of Canterbury he had been offered wafer bread, "such as (I am informed) is in use in the Church of Rome. As I have no wish," the letter continued, "to be a partaker in idolatry or to enter into communion with that apostate Church, I at once returned the wafer to the minister who gave it me, with these words, 'This is not bread, I refuse to take it.'" The Archbishop replied that the rubric was somewhat ambiguous. At the time when it was framed, many preferred ordinary bread, and many—probably a majority—preferred the old practice and used unleavened bread. The rubric did not say that thenceforth ordinary bread was to be used, but simply that the new practice must suffice. To tolerate both sides was a very common method of putting an end to a quarrel. Unleavened bread was certainly used by our Lord at the first institu-

tion of the Sacrament. Its use continued from the Apostles' times. The early Christians did not make a point of the use of either. The Western Church gradually settled down into the use of unleavened bread, while the Greek Church took the other view, and has for centuries used leavened bread. He thought his correspondent was making a great deal too much of an unimportant matter. "You cannot really think that the Sacrament becomes idolatrous if the bread is of the same kind as that which our Lord used."

The correspondent pointed out that the Privy Council had twice pronounced the use of wafer bread to be illegal, and yet the Archbishop thought it of such small importance as not to be worth mentioning. To this the Archbishop replied that he was dealing in his former letter with the charge of idolatry, and that on the charge of illegality a clergyman could be prosecuted in the Consistory Court. After a lengthy rejoinder from his correspondent, the Archbishop's chaplain wrote that his Grace did not see any advantage in continuing the correspondence, as the person aggrieved was not in the parish where the matter of complaint arose.

The Archbishop's views and action in cases of the remarriage of a divorced person fall rather into that part of his life which he spent as Bishop of London. The matter was brought before him as Archbishop on one occasion by the Rev. W. Black, in a letter dated February 6, 1899, in which Mr. Black stated that the Prayer Book and Canon declared marriage indissoluble. The Archbishop replied on the 7th, from Lambeth, as follows:—

REVEREND SIR—The Book of Common Prayer does not pronounce marriage indissoluble. It declares that whom God hath joined together no man may put asunder.

Our Lord's exception in the case of adultery shows that a divorce in such a case is not man's doing but the Lord's.—
Yours faithfully, F. CANTUAR.

Mr. Black did not accept the Archbishop's argument.

We must now turn to one of the great events of Dr. Temple's Primacy, the hearings on incense, etc.

Reference was made above (page 274), in connexion with the Encyclical Letter of the Lambeth Conference, to Dr. Temple's view of the direction in the preface to the Book of Common Prayer with regard to the solution of cases of doubt. In private conference the Archbishop frequently pressed the advisability of this method, as his predecessor had done. It was known that Dr. Temple^a would welcome such a reference to himself by any bishop who for sufficient reasons did not feel willing to decide cases of doubt on great and general questions of a ritual character. It may perhaps be well to give the actual words of the direction, though every one has it in that most interesting and valuable document, the preface to the Prayer Book, a document which very few persons in any walk of life have read through :—

And forasmuch as nothing can be so plainly set forth, but doubts may arise in the use and practice of the same ; to appease all such diversity (if any arise) and for the resolution of all doubts, concerning the manner how to understand, do, and execute, the things contained in this Book ; the parties that so doubt, or diversely take anything, shall alway resort to the Bishop of the Diocese, who by his discretion shall take order for the quieting and appeasing of the same ; so that the same order be not contrary to anything contained in this book. And if the Bishop of the Diocese be in doubt, then he may send for the resolution thereof to the Archbishop.

Certain bishops, declaring themselves to be in doubt in regard to the lawfulness of the use of

incense and of processional lights by certain of their clergy in public worship, arranged to send for the resolution thereof to the Archbishop. Inasmuch as the cases selected affected both provinces, the two Archbishops sat together at Lambeth, and heard counsel on both sides through several days. The full arguments of counsel for and against the lawfulness of the use of incense and of processional lights in public worship were published in book form by Longmans and by Spottiswoode. For our present purpose we are not concerned with these arguments. Our concern is only with the Archbishop's treatment of them.

The decision of the Archbishops was delivered by Dr. Temple at Lambeth on July 31, 1899. There is no secret in regard to the fact that the formal document was written entirely by himself, and submitted by him in its complete form to his brother Archbishop. This has been made the subject of adverse comment; but very little thought is needed to show that after all it was the only reasonable course. The attempt to draft such a document in a committee of two, or to make a *cento* of paragraphs and sentences and arguments prepared by the two Archbishops, would almost certainly have ended in the production of a piece of work neither concise nor clear. And it may be taken as certain that a prelate of the wide experience and excellent judgment which the Archbishop of York possessed, would, after having ensured a precise understanding on the main lines of the decision and the main arguments on which it was based, request his colleague in the matter to put it into formal words. Under the conditions which existed, it appears to be convenient for our present purpose to speak of "the Archbishop," not "the Archbishops," in describing the methods by which the end was reached.

The document is redolent of the Primate's method and manner. Its first words go straight to the point, without a word as to the difficulties of the case, or a suggestion that it had been well argued, though a reference is eventually made to these points. The Archbishop was not wont to speak of difficulties or to pay compliments when he was bent on business. These are the opening words :—

The questions put before us at the present time are two : the lawfulness of the liturgical use of incense, and the lawfulness of carrying lights in procession, in the public worship of the Church of England.

There is no direction in the Book of Common Prayer either enjoining or authorising either of these practices. But it is argued that they are practically sanctioned by the Ornaments Rubric prefixed to the Order for Morning Prayer. And it is consequently this Rubric that we have to interpret. It seems most convenient first to interpret it as it stands, and then to consider whether any circumstances tend to contravene or modify this interpretation.

It will be well to quote the actual words of the Rubric :—

And here is to be noted, That such Ornaments of the Church, and of the ministers thereof at all times of their ministration, shall be retained, and be in use, as were in this Church of England by the authority of Parliament, in the second year of the reign of King Edward the Sixth.

The Archbishop's interpretation proceeds on the principle that the Rubric imposes two limitations on the Ornaments :—

Any Ornament¹ which is not required at any time of the ministration of the ministers, and any Ornament which was not in use by authority of Parliament in the second year of King Edward the Sixth, is not an Ornament to which the Rubric applies.

¹ Ornament, as is now well known, has nothing to do with the idea of decoration. It is the Latin *ornamentum*, apparatus, furniture, etc.

The Archbishop's view was that the former of these limitations was the stricter, in fact that it might well exclude Ornaments included under the latter, and he therefore dealt with it first and fully. It may be better to dispose of the other first on the present occasion. This is what the Archbishop says near the end of the decision :—

We have examined the first of these limitations, and have concluded that it forbids the use of incense and of lights carried in procession in public worship. It is obvious that this conclusion makes it unnecessary to examine at any length the second limitation. Whether, as seems most probable, the authority of Parliament in the second year of the reign of King Edward the Sixth means the first Act of Uniformity, and therefore the Prayer Book of 1549, or means the immediately preceding state of the law, does not affect the arguments which we have used.

The Archbishop then states the difficulty caused by the anomalous rule which made the operation of an Act to date from the first day of the Session in which it was passed, that is, some time before the Royal Assent, and adds, "But it is not necessary for us to enter into this matter now, as the questions before us are sufficiently determined without reference to the point."

We can now turn to the main grounds of the decision against the lawfulness of incense and processional lights in public worship, as being "Ornaments not required at any time of the ministration of the ministers," to quote the Archbishop's way of stating the force of this part of the Rubric.

The ministration of the ministers is contained in and prescribed by the Book of Common Prayer. It is there that we find what is the form to be observed in all the offices of public worship. . . . The 36th Canon requires from every clergyman, and every clergyman has ever since made and still makes, a solemn promise containing the same words,

that he will use the form in the said Book prescribed and none other.¹

Against this it is contended that the Prayer Book of 1549 contains ceremonies which are not in the Prayer Book of 1552, and that since omission is not prohibition, these omitted ceremonies are still lawful under the later Act. Whether omission is prohibition it is not necessary for us to consider. But prohibition is prohibition; and nothing can be clearer than the words used in the Act of 1559 prohibiting the use of any ceremony not ordered in the Book.

The words of the Act are certainly clear :—

All and singular ministers in any Cathedral or Parish Church or other place . . . shall . . . be bounden to say and use the Mattins Evensong Celebration of the Lord's Supper and administration of each of the Sacraments and all their common and open prayer, in such order and form as is mentioned in the said fifth and sixth year of the reign of King Edward the Sixth [with the one or two well-known variations stated] and none other or otherwise.

The Archbishop then disposes of the argument that the Act of 1559, not having previously received the assent of Convocation, is not binding on the consciences of the clergy, by the remark that the Act was fully accepted by the Church at the time and its authority was never questioned, and by the fact that it was fully set forth in the beginning of the Manuscript Prayer Book signed by Convocation on December 20, 1661, and then presented to the King, the Act being "thus formally adopted by the authority of the Church."

It is quite true (the Archbishop proceeds) that there may be variations which are so brief, so long in use, so unimportant, that a Bishop would be justified in refusing to allow a clergyman to be prosecuted because of his use of them. Four examples are stated, namely, the words said by the people before and after the Gospel, the saying of the General Thanksgiving by the people, and the omission of

¹ The Archbishop has previously stated the three cases of exception as ordered by lawful authority.

part of the notice of Holy Communion. These practices are probably in strictness all illegal; but no Bishop would be wise in allowing a prosecution for such unimportant deviations from the strict letter of the law. This, however, cannot be said of the introduction of any ceremony which is conspicuous, not sanctioned by long-continued custom in our Church, and of such a nature as to change the general character and aspect of the Service.

The Archbishop then deals with the argument that the Act of 1559 was not really and generally obeyed at the time, and probably was never intended to be so obeyed; and with the fact that instances had been given of the use of incense at the time and for long afterwards.

The time, he says, was a time of great excitement and unsettlement. Insurrection and civil war might come at any time. Elizabeth would have preferred to bring back the First Book of Edward VI.; but a compromise was necessary, and the Second Book with some modifications was taken, the Ornaments of the First Book being revived, but only until the Sovereign might make some different order. The Crown was empowered with the consent of the then Ecclesiastical Commissioners, or of the Archbishop of Canterbury, to order additional rites and ceremonies at discretion.

No doubt, he continues, the Act was imperfectly obeyed; practices which were no longer lawful under its provisions were still maintained here and there. There was conscious disobedience and unconscious. But the precise and clear statements of the Act gradually prevailed, and forbidden ceremonies gradually disappeared.

As regards incense, the Archbishop explains, along with the liturgical use there was the use for sweetening a church, and this caused confusion of the two uses and led to a continuance of the liturgical use for some time. When the cases

of fumigatory use are struck out, "the number of cases in which incense was used in worship is utterly insufficient as evidence to show any widespread interpretation of the law as permitting the retention of the old usage in spite of the plain words of the Statute."

He then enters upon positive reasons which, as he believed, led the English Churchmen to abandon the use of incense in public worship, "not as an evil thing, but as unsuited to the needs of the day."

First, the need of greater simplicity. The services were too complicated. "Symbolism may easily be pushed to lengths which divert the attention from what the symbolism is intended to teach to the symbolism itself. The liturgical use of incense was described on the part of those who advocated it before us as very complicated in its detail."

Secondly, the liturgical use was specially connected with the office for the Holy Communion, in relation to which many serious errors had arisen, and the authorities had a strong desire to make that whole Office as nearly as it could suitably be made a precise repetition of the original institution. Even the mixing of water with the wine was dropped for the same reason, though nothing was said to prevent its being mixed beforehand. It is true that the wine of the Passover was a mixed cup, but there is no suggestion that it was mixed afresh by our Lord for the purpose of His Sacrament.

Thirdly, incense was certainly not in use in the Church for at least three hundred years from the Apostolic times. To make the primitive Church the model for the Church of England was certainly part of the purpose which our Reformers cherished.

At the close of the decision the Archbishop

makes an acute remark on the interpretation of the Ornaments Rubric. It is often carelessly interpreted as if the order to use the Ornaments was *per se* an order to use the appropriate ceremonies. But this would make Elizabeth's Act order a strict adherence to the form of ceremonial prescribed in the Book, and at the same time order the revival of a number of ceremonies of which the Book says nothing. It inverts the relation between a ceremony and an ornament, by making the ceremony subordinate to the ornament, not the ornament to the ceremony. To order a ceremony indirectly, by ordering the use of an ornament connected with it, is without precedent. Lastly, the words "at all times of their ministrations" are, in that case, not unmeaning merely, but misleading.

A few words of the decision itself will suffice for quotation:—

In conclusion, we are far from saying that incense in itself is an unsuitable or undesirable accompaniment to Divine worship. But this is not the question before us. . . . We are obliged to come to the conclusion that the use of incense in the public worship, and as a part of that worship, is not at present enjoined nor permitted by the law of the Church of England.

The carrying of lights in procession was ruled out on "precisely the same line of reasoning." "There is no authority for such processions, and they are therefore neither enjoined nor permitted."

The Archbishop was properly careful to keep quite clear the fact that the decision did not condemn the use of incense in itself, apart from the question of the present state of the law of England. With characteristic frankness he informed all whom his words should reach that in his opinion it was "right to observe that even now the liturgical use of incense is not by law permanently excluded from the Church's Ritual. The Crown,

with the consent of the Archbishop of Canterbury, could on some great occasion order a great ceremonial in which the use of incense should form part. It might not be probable that this should be done; but many things not probable now might become probable when our toleration of one another had risen to a higher level."

A question of real practical importance at once arose, namely this,—At what point does "the public worship" begin? On this point the Archbishop wrote as follows to the Bishop of Winchester:—

MY DEAR BISHOP OF WINCHESTER — A procession with incense is clearly an additional ceremony not ordered in the Book of Common Prayer, and clearly neither enjoined nor permitted as a part of public worship. Every clergyman has promised to use the form in that book prescribed and none other. A procession with incense would be an addition to that form. According to our present law, incense cannot be used in our public worship at all. If it is to be used it must be so used as not in any way to be a part of public worship.

On Friday, January 19, 1900, a deputation waited on the Archbishop at Lambeth to present a "solemn protest against the opinion which the Archbishops had recently put forward on the subject of incense and processional lights," signed by nearly 14,000 lay communicants of the Church in the two provinces. The Duke of Newcastle, Lord Edward Spencer Churchill, and Mr. R. W. Burnie addressed his Grace.

The Archbishop said in effect:—

(1) His business had been to see what the Church of England had done in the matter under consideration, for the Church claimed and had the right to alter ceremonies, and could not be said to have acted uncatholically in abandoning the use of incense, a use which did not come under the rule *quod semper*.

(2) He had not, as was asserted, based himself on an Act of Parliament. He had carefully taken the 36th Canon of 1603 as his starting-point, and had pointed out that the

Church of England had in that Canon adopted the words which the Act of 1559 had previously used. Further, the Book of Common Prayer of 1661, signed by the Bishops on December 21 of that year, and presented to the King as the work of the Convocations which had been sitting to revise the Book, actually contained Elizabeth's Act of 1559, not precedent to the title but within the title, and therefore as part of the Book signed and presented to the King on the part of the Church for legislation by Act of Parliament. He had merely used that Act as a convenient and fuller expression of the same words as used in the 36th Canon.

(3) The Book of Common Prayer in its preliminary part enjoined the course of action which the Archbishops, moved in prescribed course by certain bishops, had pursued. They were not, and they had never held themselves to be, a Court: for a Court had power of coercion and they had none, and a Court would have before it some person or persons liable to punishment, and they had not.

(4) The charge of tyranny or of probability of tyranny on the part of the Archbishop could not be maintained. The protest spoke of his pressing a definition "upon dioceses of which your Grace is not the ruler." The Archbishop had a right to address all the bishops and clergy in his province, and to state his views to them; it rested with the bishop of each diocese to adopt or not adopt those views, and if he adopted them, to press them or not press them upon the clergy of his diocese. There was not, in his opinion, the slightest sign of a desire to interfere with the separate action of each separate bishop in his own diocese.

(5) It was objected that the opinion was directed against certain members of one party in the Church. That was quite true. Everything must have a beginning. To say, "you must deal with all at one step," was unreasonable. Besides, the claims of those who maintain that they have a right, because of their private study of the early Church, to go outside the Prayer Book altogether, were very much more far-reaching in their consequences than the claims of those who neglect what is before them. "It is a very serious thing if men claim that they may pick up here and there practices from the history of the early Church which approve themselves to their minds, and then insist, without any authority, that they may make them part of the worship of the Church of England." Omissions such as had that day been brought before him were not of the same importance, because those

who break the law by omission, for example by not reading the Athanasian Creed, do not claim that the Church Catholic commands them so to do.

(6) The protest set up a claim inconsistent with the Catholic principle of obedience. Did those present think it very respectful to address to an authority very distinctly set up by the laws of the Church the words, "We protest against your Grace's attempt to foist upon the Church . . ." ? And the declaration was a disregard of the authority, not of the Archbishops only, but also of the Bishops,—“We will resist to the utmost a precedent which may lead us into a position differing but little from that against which the Church rightly protested 300 years ago.” He found it very difficult to believe that they seriously thought there was peril of a claim of such absolute submission as that made by the Papacy.

(7) It had been said that day that the one remedy was disestablishment. He did not think that those who looked to that escape from the control of bishops would like it when they got it. Besides that, the loss to the religious life of the nation would be greater than they could measure. That loss was the one anxiety that beset him in all these matters. “I am quite ready to face disestablishment and its necessary concomitant, disendowment, if it be God's will. I am quite prepared in that case still to go on and act as if we stood in the same position as that which we have held for the last 300 years. But (here the voice broke with deep emotion) I dread, with all my soul I dread, what may come, if the Church of England were to break in two.”

The Archbishop then pronounced the benediction.

Immediately afterwards he terminated the interview in a characteristically friendly and genial manner.

In the decision on the question of the Reservation of the Blessed Sacrament, the Archbishop acted alone. There was no case brought up from the province of York, and the Archbishop of York did not sit.

The Archbishop took a line parallel to that which he followed in the decision on incense and

processional lights. In the administration of the Sacraments, the clergy have promised to use the form prescribed in the Book of Common Prayer. There is not in that Book "any single mention of, or allusion to, the practice of Reservation, except in the close of the 28th Article, where it is said the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper was not by Christ's ordinance reserved, carried about, lifted up, or worshipped. It will obviously require overwhelming evidence to prove that reservation in any sense whatever is part of the form prescribed in the Book of Common Prayer." That trenchant directness and simplicity of statement is intensely characteristic of Dr. Temple. The tone of mind which it reveals was not sympathetic to subtleties and refinements and the reading in of practices not specifically mentioned. It would not be difficult to travesty the argument to the extent of making it show that if nothing is to be done but what is definitely prescribed in the Book of Common Prayer, the services cannot be performed nor the Sacraments administered. It would be unfair to the Archbishop's use of the argument thus to travesty it. But it was not unnaturally felt, by those whose practice was condemned, that it was not quite a clear and fair statement of their case.

The Archbishop divided "reservation" into three forms. The first, the practice of taking the consecrated elements at the time of administration to persons not able to be present in the Church; in other words, the extension of the area of administration. This Dr. Benson believed to be lawful, Dr. Westcott allowed, and other bishops are prepared to allow on sufficient cause shown. It is not "reservation" in any known sense of that word, ecclesiastical or secular. But the Archbishop had a deep-seated objection to its allowance, and maintained with great vigour that it was "clean

contrary to the plain words of the Rubric." The second, the keeping back a portion of the consecrated elements in order to administer them to certain sick persons at a later period of the day. The third, the keeping back of a portion of the consecrated elements in case there should be a sudden demand for communicating a dying person. It is worthy of remark that the Archbishop had nothing to say on Reservation in its fullest sense, when the elements are reserved not for the sick and not for an emergency.

Of the first form, the Archbishop allowed that it was in use in the time of Justin Martyr, not for the sick only, but for any absent persons. "This shows," he said in his decision, "that such a practice was quite consistent with the Christian Faith, and there was nothing in it that was wrong in itself." But he maintained that the Church of England, having the right of a national Church to alter or abolish rites and ceremonies of man's ordaining, had intentionally disused the "ancient and general practice." He stated, also, that the Church of England had given to the clergy, in the form for the Communion of the Sick, the means of obeying the Canon of Nicæa, which enjoins care that "the dying shall be not deprived of the Communion before death."

Counsel had used the case of *Escott v. Mastin*, which declared the validity—not the regularity—of lay baptism, as showing that an ancient practice of the Church cannot be discontinued simply because mention is not made of it in the Book of Common Prayer. The Archbishop decided that there was no question as to the validity of the Sacrament when administered by reserved elements; the question was, Was the priest forbidden to administer in that way? "and on this point *Escott v. Mastin* decides nothing."

In regard to the other forms of Reservation, the

Archbishop founded his decision on the words of the 28th Article—the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper was not by Christ's ordinance reserved, carried about, lifted up, or worshipped—which cannot be taken otherwise “than as condemning the practice altogether,” for they declare that “those who do these things use for one purpose what our Lord ordained for another.” Counsel had argued that “reserved” in this place must mean for purposes of worship, not for the sick.

This interpretation (he replied) is partly sound, but the inference drawn from it cannot be admitted. For all the four prohibitions must be taken together, and all of them in connexion with the doctrine of Transubstantiation emphatically repudiated just before. By worshipping is meant any external act of devotion, and this is the chief object of prohibition. . . . And in the evidence put before us it was admitted that those who practised Reservation used external acts of devotion also, thus proving that even now, so long after the doctrine of Transubstantiation has been condemned, the steps which once led to that doctrine follow at once upon a revival of the opportunities which the Article prohibits. The reason for the prohibition is clear. These practices led to gross abuse which the Church of England felt bound to stop.

To the argument that “the difficulties of administering the Holy Communion to the sick in their own houses are such that Reservation is necessary in order to deal with them,” the Archbishop replied in substance as follows. Administration to those who are too ill to understand fully what they are doing is not to be desired under any circumstances. The Holy Communion is not to be used as a magical charm, without co-operation on the part of the recipient. The means is faith. If the sick person is conscious but is too ill to bear the full service for the Communion of the Sick, *necessitas non habet leges*, the service itself indicates the propriety of shortening it; the priest must use

the essential parts, namely, the Prayer of Consecration and the words of Administration, with such other parts, if any, as the sufferer can bear.

In answering the argument that it is very hard for those priests, who will not communicate except fasting, to be required to fast till such late hour as may be suitable for the sick person, Dr. Temple turned to St. Augustine and St. Chrysostom. In their time "the practice of fasting as a preparation for the Holy Communion had become in a sense universal, or almost universal. But it had not become a law of the Church, had not been ordered by any General Council, was not enforced by authority, was very largely left to individual discretion." St. Chrysostom's sermons showed the general mind of the Church. Even when speaking of the Lenten fast, which was enjoined by authority, that Father treated fasting not as having a virtue of its own, but as a means to an end; he admitted bodily weakness as a reasonable plea for omitting to fast. This branch of the subject the Archbishop dismissed thus:—

To treat fasting before receiving the Holy Communion as a rigid obligation which is to interfere with ministerial duties or with the comfort of the sick, is quite alien from the spirit of such teaching as this. Without taking a full meal, such moderate partaking of food as will relieve any serious strain would be fully consistent with any obligation that the early Christians recognised. For to diminish the usual quantity of food is to fast, even though the diminution does not amount to a total abstention.

The Archbishop's final decision was as follows:—

In conclusion, after weighing carefully all that has been put before us, I am obliged to decide that the Church of England does not at present allow Reservation in any form, and that those who think it ought to be allowed, though perfectly justified in endeavouring to get the proper authorities to alter the law, are not justified in practising Reservation until the law has been altered.

CHAPTER VI

VARIOUS VISITS AND ADDRESSES

Church Congresses—Nottingham—Bradford—London—Newcastle—Brighton—Church Endowments—Welsh Church—Reading the Bible—Hostels—The study of language—Visits to Bristol—Hereford—Norwich—Wakefield—Salisbury—Cambridge University.

MENTION has already been made of the remarkable vigour with which the Archbishop journeyed to all parts of the kingdom to deliver addresses. It may not be out of place to mention here a few of such occasions, with notes of his addresses; and, first, the five Church Congresses which he attended during his tenure of the Primacy.

The Archbishop attended the meeting of the Church Congress at Nottingham in September 1897, having been on terms of personal friendship with the Bishop of Southwell (Dr. Ridding) long before either of them was a bishop. "There is no bishop," he informed the Mayor and Corporation in response to their welcome, "with whom I am more glad to be associated in Church work than my old and warm friend the Bishop of Southwell."

The Archbishop preached the opening sermon, on the text, "Where two or three are gathered together in My name, there am I in the midst of them." He dwelt at length, and with happy illustrations, on the force of the essential condition

“in My name,” and brought his sermon to its conclusion as follows :—

This, surely, is the meaning of these three words “In My name”; and as we strive towards the fulfilment of that meaning to the uttermost, so, assuredly, will the blessing come that He has promised; and it will come, as it always comes, in far greater abundance than we could possibly measure. His promises are wonderful; but the fulfilment of His promises passes all human imagination. It is greater, always greater, than the promises themselves; and I pray you, brethren, that throughout all your assemblies during this week which is now before us, you let the thought that the Lord is here amongst us never be altogether absent from your minds.

At the Working Men’s Meeting the Archbishop was received with special and prolonged cheering as he entered and left the Victoria Hall, and the enthusiasm when he rose to speak and when he sat down was very great. The general line of his address was (1) the high esteem in which men of work should be held and by him were held, (2) the duty of the Church to deliver the same message to the rich and to the poor, to preach the same Gospel to all classes without distinction.

When the Archbishop was on the platform of the railway station the next morning, ready to leave for London, a man came up to him and stroked his arm, saying to Mrs. Temple, “I felt I must touch him, after what he said to us last night.”

It is probable that at the Church Congress at Bradford, in September 1898, the Archbishop made an impression as indelible as any of the deep impressions which by his passionate earnestness, and by the clearness and cogency of the expression of his logical thought, he made wherever he went. And it is probable that if the thousands whom he addressed had known to the full the

physical effort he was making, the impression would have been driven even deeper still.

He arrived at Bradford at 1.48 on the afternoon of Tuesday, September 27, and attended the evening meeting, at which a paper on the position of laymen in the first four centuries was read. The reader having maintained the late origin of Episcopacy by the argument from early silence, the Archbishop rose and—entirely *impromptu*—overthrew the argument from silence in a manner so masterly and so full of illustration as almost to lead his hearers to suppose that the matter had long been a main subject of thought with him. He showed that writers of contemporary history, and writers who note or refer to contemporary events without professing to write history, take chief notice of occurrences out of ordinary course, do not dwell upon that which to them is too obvious to need mention. He pointed out how perpetually we have to regret that early writers do not tell us about the obvious, and thus leave us in complete ignorance of the very things we should most like to know. The very early origin and development of Episcopacy was to the Christian of the time too obvious to need statement; it was taken for granted that those who should read would know what the writer knew of a fact of common knowledge. The Archbishop did the whole thing thoroughly, cleanly, and with graceful courtesy. It needed doing, and no one else could have done it so well. The great assembly was profoundly thankful.

At a later period of an evening highly charged with electricity, after Lord Halifax had spoken, the President called upon Mr. Kensit, amid much laughter at the quaint proximity. Mr. Kensit delivered his various “points” amid silence from all except his own followers, and then turned to a violent attack upon the Archbishops and Bishops,

declaring them false to their trust. It was noticed by every one, and it helped much to keep the electricity from becoming actively dangerous, that the details of the attack afforded to the Archbishop the greatest amusement.

The reception of the Archbishop at the Men's Meeting, and the farewell when he left to attend the overflow meeting, were really undescrivable. The general line of his address in St. George's Hall was the duty of mutual self-sacrifice. He ended a noble address thus :—

God knows if I could in any way, by preaching that great part of the Communion of Saints, make men generally feel how they are living one in another, and how every single soul has his share of responsibility for his fellows, and every single soul his blessing from undertaking that responsibility, and how any single soul receives a blessing from the fellowship of his fellows in everything that he undertakes—if I could impress that upon my countrymen generally, I would be content to do nothing more in all my life than to preach this greatest of all Christian doctrines.

At the Mechanics' Institute, where the overflow meeting was held, the Archbishop had what was fitly described as “a tremendous reception.”

But then comes the most remarkable fact of all. He went straight to the railway station, accompanied by masses of men determined to shake hands with him before he left; travelled through the night; arrived at Lambeth two hours before sunrise, between three and four o'clock in the morning; and at a quarter past ten that morning he was present, robed, in the Jerusalem Chamber, and proceeded to the long and ordinarily fatiguing service of the Consecration of Bishops. The two bishops consecrated under these unique conditions were Dr. Macarthur of Bombay and Dr. Pym of Mauritius.

It was a great disappointment to the Archbishop,

and a very great disappointment to all others, that an attack of bronchitis prevented his taking, on the great occasion of the Church Congress meeting for the first time in London, in 1899, the part he had so nobly taken at the two previous Congresses. He preached the opening sermon with almost painful effort at St. Paul's, with a strong plea for unity in the Church; spoke a few words with increased effort at the Men's Meeting; and the next day, in place of his promised appearance at another meeting, a telegram came to announce that he was forbidden to leave the house.

Notwithstanding the state of his health, suffering as he was from asthma as well as bronchitis, he persisted in going to Durham on the Saturday of the Congress week, October 14, though his doctor said he would not be responsible for the consequences. He was himself convinced that every mile he put between himself and London would do him good. He preached in Durham on Sunday, the 15th, spoke at Sunderland on Monday, and left for London early on Tuesday morning. To his great disappointment, he was forced to abandon a visit to Hereford on the next day, Wednesday. The following Sunday he was in Cambridge. That was the way in which a man of nearly seventy-nine dealt with an attack of bronchitis and asthma.

The Archbishop's notes of his visit to the Church Congress at Newcastle in 1900 are of the nature usual with him: "Leave Lambeth September 25, evening meeting, 7.30-10; 26th, 10.30 to 1, 7.30; 27th, 10.30 to 1, leave meeting 12, train 12.54."

The writer of the general account in the *Guardian* remarked on the inclemency of the weather, and the probably consequent absence of outward signs of enthusiasm on the first day. At the evening meeting the Congress hall was not half filled; but, to the delight of those who had

faced the severity of the weather, all unexpected the Archbishop of Canterbury appeared. In a moment it was seen that enthusiasm had been only dormant. It burst out unrestrainedly, and again when, in response to the President's call, he rose to speak on the Church's policy in elementary education. And a very able speech it was, emphasising the point he so frequently pressed, that the future of religious education lay in the sacrifices that Churchmen were personally prepared to make, rather than in schemes which depended for maintenance on rates and taxes.

At the Men's Meeting on the Wednesday evening, the Archbishop had a very great reception. He spoke of the power of sympathy between man and man, as taught by the life of Christ with its sympathy with men and its sacrifice for men. It was the love of God for us that taught us in the highest sense the love of man for man. He concluded by asking them to consider what it was that made the character of our Lord stand above everything that could be in any way compared with it; it was its self-sacrifice—self-sacrifice for us. In this He showed us His love, and asked us to take it as He gave it. This it was that made us certain of His love, and this certainty it was that gave to Christianity its power to lift a man above his trials and his troubles. Thus it was that man learned that God loved him and learned to love God. "When a man has learned to love God, there is nothing else worth his while to learn in comparison with that." '

At the Church Congress at Brighton in 1901 the Archbishop again made a surprise visit, going down from Lambeth for the afternoon only, to be present at the discussion on the Housing of the Poor. He was as warmly cheered as ever. He maintained, from his long experience of life, that it

was impossible to deal really effectively with the difficulties of any class, unless co-operation of the class itself was given. Coercive legislation frequently failed to produce the result aimed at. The all-potent factor of greed had to be reckoned with as an opposing force; and it was frequently impossible to get legislative enactments carried out by those who were responsible under the law. As a general advice he would say to them that the philanthropist who made himself really interested in and acquainted with the individual, would succeed better than the philanthropist who devoted himself to propounding and promoting theories and schemes of philanthropy.

The Archbishop made an important contribution to the discussion on the endowments of the Church of England, on the occasion of an address at Canterbury on the Benefices Bill by Mr. A. G. Boscawen, M.P., on April 14, 1898. They were often told that the endowments were given when the English Church was Papal. But the Papal pretensions were very different at the time of endowments from what they had come to be at the Reformation. Ample proof of that was given by the complaints of the Popes themselves about the way in which England resisted their growing demands. The first meeting of the Council of Trent was got together by the Emperor Charles V. for the express purpose of reforming the Church, and the proposals there made went as far as anything that the Church of England did. It was of great importance that such facts should be kept before the people. They were told, again, that the endowments were national property. They were not national, nor were they private. They were trust property, and should be sacred as such. So long as trustees fulfilled the purposes of a trust, it was the rule of the nation not to interfere, unless it

could be shown that the trust itself was of such a character that it ought not to continue. The only property distinctly marked with the Papal character at the time of the Reformation was what was known as "chantry" property, foundations for prayers for the souls of the departed ; because it was so marked, it was taken from the Church and given to the King for national purposes. The property of the monasteries was taken away—more, in his judgment, than should have been taken—not because it was national, but because the monasteries had become mischievous and tended to an *imperium in imperio*. Further, the Church of England in her ecclesiastical courts had never acknowledged canons of the Western Church unless they had been accepted by the Church of England herself. If people said the endowments were given to the Church of Rome, the answer was that the Church of England never was and never allowed that it was in that sense a part of the Church of Rome ; rather than allow that, it broke away from the Church of Rome.

On Monday, May 23, 1898, the Archbishop had an opportunity of expressing his views of the duty of England to the Welsh Church. The occasion was a meeting of the Additional Curates' Society in the great hall of the Church House, to consider Welsh needs. He said there were two special reasons why in connexion with the supply of clergy England should help Wales. The first was that in some parts of Wales the growth of the population had been enormous ; the case was very much the same as that of London. The other was, that in the country parts the Church was very inadequately supplied with clergy. The Church was steadily winning its way, but in the out-of-the-way parts they had not nearly enough men. All efforts should be made to increase their staff of clergy. It

might be added, as experience had showed them, that the Welsh Church was attacked as being the weakest point of the Church of England. It therefore behoved the Church of England to make really strong the part which opponents seemed to regard as its weakest part.

In October 1901 the Archbishop visited St. Asaph and preached in the Cathedral on the occasion of a Conference.

At the Conference in the afternoon 2400 persons were present, and in the evening 3419. Every Nonconformist minister signed an address of welcome to the Archbishop, and the cordial and dignified speech of the Rev. Thomas Lloyd, the minister who presented the address, made a great impression on the Conference. Such an address and such a speech would have been hardly possible some years before. It was an evidence of the growth of a sense of unity of purpose amid differences of form, of a feeling that there must be a co-operation of Christians if Wales was to continue to be a God-fearing country. But the welcome and enthusiasm shown were a tribute to the character of the Archbishop. The man himself, his fearless justice, his tender-hearted advocacy of the cause of the weak and suffering, his splendid service to the cause of temperance, had touched the heart of Wales as no man—it was asserted—except Mr. Gladstone had touched it for a hundred years.

On Sunday morning, November 11, 1900, the Archbishop preached to the Christ's Hospital boys at Christ Church, Newgate Street. The sermon was founded by a benefactor of Christ's Hospital, Mr. Thomas Barnes, in commemoration of the accession of Queen Elizabeth to the throne in 1558 and the completion of the Reformation. The sermon had been preached in that Church every year since 1668. The Archbishop took for his text

2 Tim. iii. 14, 15. The main point of his address was the large place which the reading of the Word of God occupied in the reformed services, larger, it was said, than in the services of any other body of Christians. In ordinary services they might say that every Sunday in this country six portions of the Bible were read in regular order, and in various ways the Book of Common Prayer suggested to Christians to read the Bible constantly. He would not ask a boy to give more than a quarter of an hour every day to the reading of the Bible, but he would ask him to give that if possible at the same hour of each successive day.

On November 20, 1900, the Archbishop presided at a meeting in the library of Canterbury Cathedral in aid of a new Training College, St. Gabriel's, Kennington. There were, he said, two distinct parts of the College, and in that respect the College differed from anything they had had before. There was the residential College, where the girls received religious instruction according to the teaching of the Church of England, and there were a number of girls who lived at their homes or in boarding-houses approved and licensed by the Committee, who would receive the same secular instruction as the others, but not any religious instruction. The Government grant depended on their receiving students from the outside who were protected by a conscience clause and did not receive religious teaching according to the Church of England. For his part he was not sorry that this condition was imposed. He thought that their admission of such students tended to bring into discussions on this subject a less bitter spirit than usually attended upon controversy. But, personally, he cared more that the teachers should be religious than that they should be anything else that could be named. It was, of course, indispensable that they should also

be good teachers; but that was a consideration which belonged altogether to a lower rank than the devotion of the soul and character to those high truths which religion must of necessity be perpetually inculcating.

On Saturday, October 5, 1901, the Archbishop gave the prizes at the Royal Grammar School, Sheffield, and took the opportunity of saying something to the boys on the use of language. Science, he told them, was the study of the works of God, or, as some would define it, of the works of nature. The most remarkable thing that God had made was man. There was a tendency to regard only the body of man, no other part of him, as a subject for the study of science. But that was not so. That which marked man out from all other creatures was the power of speech. The chief instrument by which men moved was the study of the thoughts of others, and of their expression in words. A man who had acquired the power of perfectly clear speech had acquired a very great power. A book produced an influence upon generation after generation: who could count the influence of the Bible! It was nonsense to speak as if the study of human speech and of human thought, and of all that could be expressed in words, was not as truly scientific as the study of chemistry or of the highest mathematics. What could be more important to a man than that he should be able to make his meaning clear? The use of grammatical rules was to produce clearness of utterance. Latin was a much clearer language than Greek, and the modern language that came nearest to it was French. They must not be asked to give up the study of the laws of human speech because they related to words, not things, nor be told that it was far more important to know how much salt could be dissolved in boiling water than to know the relation of a relative

pronoun to its antecedent. What a gain it would be if all our legislators knew grammar enough to make their laws intelligible! The country had to employ a body of highly trained and highly paid men to tell what the laws made by the legislators really meant. He was glad that the great development of natural science should go on; but there was nothing more important than that all should be trained in the study of human speech, and in the use of speech to aim at clearness.

On April 19, 1901, the Archbishop visited Bristol between two trains, and was the first guest received in the modest palace built by the Bishop of Bristol (Dr. Browne), a former suffragan of his in London. The occasion was a great meeting in furtherance of the work of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts. The meeting was held in the newly rebuilt Colston Hall, and was attended by the Lord Mayor and the High Sheriff and nearly three thousand people. The Bishop received him as the first Archbishop of Canterbury who had attended a conference on missionary work, held within the borders of the Diocese of Bristol, since Augustine held within that area his first and probably his second conference with the Britons; and remarked that if Augustine had possessed his latest successor's tact and courtesy, the Britons would have done whatever he asked them.

The Archbishop made in reply a stirring speech, for which he was warmly thanked by the Lord Mayor, before leaving to catch his return train to London. The visit gave a great impetus to missionary zeal in the city and neighbourhood.

Bristol was not the only See city in which the Archbishop's visit was recognised as having only one parallel in the city's history. On the occasion of his visit to Hereford, on the opening of the new

library attached to the Cathedral there, the Dean of Hereford (Dr. Leigh), in requesting him to declare the library open, stated that no Archbishop had visited the city in any other than a private manner since the year 673. In that year Theodore the Archbishop held a synod at Hereford, and Worcester was taken out of the Diocese of Hereford and made a separate see.

On March 7, 1901, the Archbishop paid a visit to Norwich and addressed two crowded meetings in support of the New Century Fund inaugurated by the Bishop of Norwich (Dr. Sheepshanks) (1) to meet the spiritual needs of the increasing population in the suburbs of Norwich; (2) to strengthen the foreign missionary work of the Church; (3) to maintain and extend Church schools. After a vigorous speech at the Agricultural Hall, under the presidency of the Mayor, and another in St. Andrew's Hall, the Bishop and the Dean (Dr. Lefroy) earnestly thanked his Grace, the former being applauded when he expressed his belief that there was not a greater man in Europe that day than Frederick Temple. A reception was afterwards held at the Palace, attended by about 500 visitors.

For Tuesday, June 18, 1901, there is an entry in the Archbishop's pocket-book—"Wakefield Cath. 9.45—9.30." That means, leave London 9.45 for Wakefield; reach London again 9.30 P.M. While in Wakefield he preached at the laying of the foundation stone of an addition to the Cathedral; spoke at a public luncheon afterwards; and spoke again at the ceremony which followed. During his visit, between two trains, he paid a surprise visit to the Central High School for girls, of which his niece, Miss Moberly, was the head; and, later, was present at the prize-giving of the Church Day Schools Company. A Bishop who was staying at

Lambeth at the time was much interested to notice the air of freshness with which the Archbishop attacked the day's letters, the moment he sat down on his return from the station at night.

It is evidently impossible to make mention in this "memory" of anything like all the occasions on which the Archbishop spoke on the subject of temperance. But it would not be right to pass unnoticed his visit to the Cambridge Union on Saturday, February 15, 1902. He had spoken at the Oxford Union on the same subject on November 2, 1898. He was received with great enthusiasm by the Cambridge undergraduates, with whom were no small number of graduate members of the Union; and when his address was ended, the thanks of those present were given with a force of enthusiasm which knew no bounds. He told them that he belonged to Oxford, but had learned to hold Cambridge in the highest estimation; indeed, he was a member of the University, for Cambridge had given him a degree, and when the degree was conferred he was pronounced to be *τετράγωνος ἀνὴρ*. He came to speak to them chiefly not of temperance, but of breach of temperance, for that it was that was affecting the best interests of the country to a very serious degree. Intemperance was damaging the people far more than any other cause of evil. There were sins that were much worse than intemperance, as sins; but he would put intemperance as among the more mischievous if not the most mischievous of sins: the hurt occasioned by intemperance to man's bodily health, to all that was most valuable in his life in relation to others, the misery caused to wives and little children, it was impossible to count. It sapped the moral strength, lowered the standard of moral conduct, degraded men below the level of manhood. Indifference to this mischief was absolutely criminal; it

was unchristian in the last degree. He had himself given up the use of intoxicating liquor altogether ; not because he had ever gone beyond self-control or set anything of a bad example to others, but because as a minister of the Gospel he had to consider how best he could deal with those who could not face the beginnings of temptation. He did not say that all should follow his example ; but he did say that of all means open to them that was the most effective. He wished he could persuade the legislature to diminish the temptation so effectively thrown in the very face of so large a number of the people. He did not wish to put down the trade in these liquors altogether, but he did want very, very largely to diminish the temptations. Most of those whom he addressed were young men who would soon have a larger influence upon their generation than they could at present have. If they desired to be useful in the world, to hold up a high standard of manliness, he begged them not to be indifferent to that terrible curse which was so widely prevalent among their fellow-countrymen.

The Archbishop visited Salisbury on the occasion of the reopening of the Cathedral Church after extensive works of repair to the spire and other parts of the building. He preached at the opening service. Two very characteristic utterances greeted the ears of the great procession formed in the grounds of the Deanery in readiness to move on to the Church immediately on the arrival of the Archbishop, whose train was late. Two choristers in their surplices had been taken in the Dean's carriage to the railway station to carry the train of the Archbishop, who was to robe in the railway carriage. When they drove up to the Deanery door it was seen that the choristers were sitting one on each side of the Archbishop on the back

seat, and the three were evidently on excellent terms. A former suffragan of Dr. Temple helped him to get out of the carriage, and remarked to the boys that they would never forget that drive with the Archbishop. "Indeed they won't! What do you think I've been telling them?" Intimate acquaintance had convinced the suffragan that it was useless to try to fathom the possibilities. "I've been telling them what a nice thing a good flogging is!"

With great thought and care the Dean had collected six clergymen to act as his Grace's chaplains who had known him in very early days. "Who are you?" he asked one of them, "I know your face but I don't know your name." "I am Hext." "What, little Hext! little Hext! Don't you remember how I hammered you on the head with a copper hammer the first day you came to Blundell's School!"

It was always so. Throughout the later part of his life there was a hearty uncontrolled vigour and "go" about him which seemed to revel in what he had to do, and brought the energy and the utterances of a quick robust boy of fifteen into the details of his eightieth year. With the addition of the word "work," the line written of him in the time of his Oxford residence remained increasingly true of him half a century later, "Temple bounding joyously to play."¹

¹ Cf. "Exeter" Memoir, vol. i. p. 323.—ED.

CHAPTER VII

CONVOCATION

Reception as Archbishop—Reform of Convocation—Hearing of cases of doubt—Benefices Bill—Unauthorised Services—Parochial Councils—Revised Version—Sunday newspapers—Reform of ecclesiastical courts—Voluntary schools, 1900—Candidates for Holy Orders—Dilapidations—Royal Warrant—Marriage with a deceased wife's sister—Obituary notice in Convocation.

THE aim of the present chapter, as also of the chapter which follows, "House of Lords," is not to describe the course of measures from their inception to their adoption or rejection, but to gather in chronological order the utterances of the Archbishop on important or interesting subjects, in order that his opinions on such subjects may be placed on record. The *dicta* of a man so great, even when uttered merely *obiter*, must have in all cases a real interest, and in many or most cases a permanent value. These two chapters may serve as a useful guide to the Chronicle of Convocation and to the pages of Hansard.

The Upper House of Convocation met under the presidency of the new Archbishop for the first time on January 26, 1897. The new Bishop of London (Dr. Creighton) proposed a resolution expressive of the loss sustained by the death of Dr. Benson. The Bishop of Winchester (Dr. David-

son), in seconding the resolution, pronounced a noble panegyric on the late Archbishop, and then in his happiest manner spoke of the warmth and unanimity of the rejoicing of the Bishops in the appointment of Dr. Temple to succeed him. He quoted the well-known lines from the *Electra* of Sophocles as extraordinarily applicable to his Grace :—

ὥσπερ γὰρ ἵππος εὐγενής, κὰν ἢ γέρων,
 ἐν τοῖσι δεινοῖς θυμὸν οὐκ ἀπώλεσεν,
 ἀλλ' ὀρθὸν οὖς ἴστησιν, ὡσαύτως δὲ σὶ
 ἡμᾶς τ' ὀτρύνεις καὐτὸς ἐν πρώτοις ἔπει.

The Archbishop, before putting the resolution, said something of his own deep regard for Dr. Benson, characteristically not taking the slightest notice of the welcome uttered by the Bishop of Winchester.

There was never a moment, as it seemed to me, when the thought of great duties to be done, the thought of obedience to be rendered, and, above all, the thought of his Lord and Master, was altogether absent from his soul. But there was one thing which I seemed to recognise, which I may add to all the rest, and that is that he showed, beyond what most other men showed, a power of growth in intellectual force, in insight, in the faculty of dealing with men, in the faculty of handling difficult matters, a power of growth which continued down to the very day of his death. Most people seem to me to come to an end of their powers at a very much earlier age. For the majority of men seem to me to have very little real power of growth after about the age of five-and-thirty or forty, but he went on growing. He became, as it were, bigger before our eyes. He certainly gained in the estimation of the public, not only because of his great experience arising from all that he had to do, but he gained also because of his own internal expansion of soul, and his whole life seemed, as it were, to be perpetually casting a light upon his own past, and I saw in his later years much in him which I had seen but had not appreciated when he was younger. Such a man as that is not easy to replace. I have been called to take his place, but I know full well how real is the

loss which the Church has sustained, and I know that, however I may exert myself, it will still be the case that the whole Church will feel that the death of the late Archbishop was a break in a great and most important work which none but he could have carried on so well.

It may be remarked here that the power of growth was in Dr. Temple's judgment a characteristic of the very highest importance. On one occasion one of his London suffragans informed him of a vacancy which had occurred in the part of London under his special care. "You must get a strong man there," the Bishop said. "What do you mean by a strong man?" "I mean by a strong man, that wherever you put him he'll grow."

REFORM OF CONVOCATION

On the same day, January 26, 1897, the Bishop of Ely (Lord Alwyne Compton), as chairman of a joint committee dealing with the reform of Convocation, moved a resolution approving a draft Canon for regulating the number of proctors for each archdeaconry in proportion to the number of benefices in the archdeaconry. The Bishop of Oxford (Dr. Stubbs) having expressed his belief that this was the wrong way of going to work, and that rules for the representation of the clergy in Convocation were never a matter upon which a Canon of the Church was passed, and many bishops having taken part in the discussion, the President concluded the debate. In reference to an opinion expressed by the Bishop of Ely that it was within the power of the Archbishop to alter the representation in Convocation, he said that if Convocation was altered by the Archbishop, and it was attempted to enforce in the ecclesiastical courts a Canon made after the alteration, it would certainly be pleaded that the Canon was invalid

because of the alteration in the body that had made it. That could be prevented by going to Parliament, not to ask for power to alter, but to ask for an Act declaring that the power existed. Such application to Parliament would not touch the character or the inherent rights of Convocation. There was, however, a feeling in the Lower House against going to Parliament so strong that he supposed it was of no use to contend against it. He did not think that to make the Canon as proposed would give what was wanted, but it would go a long way towards it. A Declaratory Act would be more easily obtained after than before making the Canon. The resolution was carried unanimously.

On February 15, 1898, the Archbishop informed the Bishop of Oxford (Dr. Stubbs) that the Home Secretary had declined to proceed in the matter of the reform of Convocation, confining his refusal to a disapproval of the method proposed, namely, that of enacting a Canon without first going to Parliament. This statement was followed by a very important speech from the Bishop of Oxford, who was throughout opposed to the attempt to proceed by way of Canon.

On May 13, 1898, the Archbishop formally stated that in accordance with precedent he had sent the Canon, as passed through both Houses, to the Home Secretary, with the request that it should be put before Her Majesty, and he had not received any formal answer from Her Majesty. This, he was told, was the practice when the Sovereign is not advised to concur with the prayer of the Presidents of Convocation. The Committee had in consequence been reappointed, and now recommended that an attempt should be made to obtain a Declaratory Act. This was ultimately agreed to.

One of the most important steps taken during the Primacy of Dr. Temple was the summoning of joint meetings of the Convocations of the two provinces.

On February 15, 1898, the Archbishop made a statement to the Upper House which has acquired historic importance. The Archbishop of York and he had agreed to put into the *agenda* of both provinces certain subjects which both might with advantage discuss. If it appeared that such discussion might best take place at a joint meeting of the two Convocations, the two Archbishops were agreed that such joint meeting might every now and then be convened.

On February 8, 1899, the *agenda* of the Upper House of the Canterbury Convocation included among the items, "The possibility of Joint Sessions of the Canterbury and York Convocations." The Archbishop informed the House that he had been in communication with the Archbishop of York on the subject, and it seemed advisable that each Archbishop should appoint a joint committee of his Convocation to report upon it to him. The final determination, and the arrangements, must from the very character of a Convocation rest with the Archbishops themselves. The first joint meeting of the committees of the whole Houses of both provinces was held in July of this year.

On May 9, 1901, the Bishop of Rochester (Dr. Talbot) brought before the Upper House the draft of a Declaratory Bill to be introduced to Parliament for the reform of Convocation. The object of the Bill was to set free the two powers which have dealt with Convocation, namely, the Royal power and the power of Convocation itself, by declaring that if with the King's licence beforehand and with the King's consent afterwards Convocation should make a change in its own constitution,

that change should not affect its continuity of life and thus its recognition by Parliament; and further, that by Order in Council there might be a union of the two Convocations. A third point, included in a draft Bill of the previous year, but on this occasion struck out by the wish of the Archbishop on grounds of policy, was to have been the recognition by statute of the House of Laymen. The Archbishop spoke in favour of the adoption of the Bill, which was carried unanimously, and said he would introduce it in the House of Lords that session. It was so small a measure that he thought there was considerable probability of its being carried that session or the next. It did not enable the Convocation to do anything they had not the right to do already. In one sense he thought that a reformed Lower House of Convocation would not be better than the present House, but it would more fully represent what the clergy felt and wanted. That was not asking for new powers. They had by the constitution of the country business to do, and the proposal was to enable them to do their business better. He could not think there would be very much discussion of a Bill which simply related to the doing of business.

THE HEARING OF CASES OF DOUBT

On February 8, 1899, the Archbishop delivered an address to the members of the Upper and Lower Houses and of the House of Laymen in the Great Hall of the Church House. His Grace dealt with three main subjects.

First, he spoke at considerable length on agreement between the two Archbishops that they should hear publicly the arguments on both sides of any case referred to them by a bishop for

resolution of doubt as to the true manner of carrying out the rubrics of the Book of Common Prayer, in accordance with the instructions given in the preface to that Book. He hoped that the clergy would see that in proposing that course the Archbishops were only proposing to them that they should submit all cases of this kind to the authority named by the Prayer Book itself, to which they had all assented; and that, after being heard before that authority, they would submit to it in accordance with their previous consent to the contents of the Book. He spoke with charming directness and simplicity, and with a sincerity which reached all hearts, on the objection that "the Archbishops are men who have formed opinions of their own on these cases." That, he said, was inevitable. He had been a bishop nearly thirty years, and had constantly had to give advice to his clergy on these very points. He had certainly formed his opinions, for it had been necessary for him to do so that he might give advice. But he certainly should not hesitate, if a clergyman or his counsel, or any expert he brought before him, convinced him that he had previously taken a wrong view and ought now to change his view, to do so. He should certainly do it, and he should certainly not think that he was doing anything which lowered him before the nation or the Church. Having said that, he did not think that alarm at being judged by men who have already formed their opinions would remain in the minds of those who had any knowledge of his past life or his past conduct. He did not pledge himself that there should not ultimately be prosecutions on these points, but before having recourse to that *ultima ratio* they ought to exhaust all peaceful means.

His second point was a proposed reform of the

ecclesiastical courts, but his remarks dealt only with the procedure of Convocation and not with principles or proposals.

The third point was the joint sittings of the Convocations. Here he repeated the remarks made in the Upper House on the same day, and added a request that the House of Laymen would report to him their opinion on the subject as speedily as might conveniently be.

BENEFICES BILL

On Tuesday, May 10, 1898, a very long discussion on the Benefices Bill before Parliament, as amended by the Standing Committee on Law, took place, opened by the Bishop of Salisbury (Dr. Wordsworth). The Archbishop took an active part throughout the debate, which was continued next day on a motion by the Bishop of Salisbury to the effect that the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge might elect to benefices in the patronage of Roman Catholics in any way which they might by statute or ordinance declare. The Archbishop remarked that he should himself prefer to allow Roman Catholic patrons to present, as was actually proposed by one of the Bills which the Bishops had carried through the House of Lords. This remark did not pass without protest.

UNAUTHORISED SERVICES

At this sitting the Bishop of London (Dr. Creighton) presented a petition from Mr John Kensit, complaining that services other than those in the Book of Common Prayer were in constant use, in most cases without lawful authority. The Archbishop made two important speeches, one in receiving the petition and the other in closing the

discussion. He said that the kind of opposition which Mr. Kensit was trying to create greatly increased the difficulties which the bishops had in dealing quietly and effectively with cases of extreme practices. He believed that the clergy concerned were more willing than they had been to pay attention to the advice of their Bishop. But he noted the fact that, while the extreme men of some years ago maintained that what they did was in accordance with the Prayer Book, extreme men now claimed to go outside the Prayer Book altogether, to put their own interpretation upon what the Church in the earlier ages did, and to act upon such interpretation by introducing novelties. He thought that by quietly and firmly requiring the clergy to keep within proper limits they would in no long time succeed in restraining extravagances they had now to deplore. He had considerable doubts how far it was wise for a bishop to inquire into practices *proprio motu*, instead of waiting until complaint is made. One special difficulty which the bishops had to meet was this, that some of the clergy complained of were such spiritual men, so devoted to their work, such examples of the deepest piety, that when they said to their Bishop, "This is the one way in which I can do my work among these poor people," it was very hard for the Bishop to say, "Nevertheless, you must discontinue it."

In summing up the discussion, the Archbishop spoke on a point which had been raised—the difference in treatment of doctrine and ritual. For some years past they had avoided all prosecutions for ritual, but his predecessor, Dr. Benson, had repeatedly said, and sometimes publicly, that they should not hesitate to prosecute in clear cases of doctrine. The latter were much the more important cases, and each bishop must decide for

himself whether or not he would go into court on such a matter. He mentioned and described a case in which he had revoked the licence of an assistant curate who had used the Invocation of Saints. He thought the laity would be relieved by the whole discussion, and he hoped that they would give to the bishops their full support in the endeavour to effect an improvement. He felt bound to add that a great many of the laity were ready to call a thing Popish, or Romish, or even sinful, because it was very like, or identical with, something done in the Church of Rome. That was absurd. They could not submit to be told that because a thing was done by that Church it was therefore heretical or evil.

PAROCHIAL COUNCILS

In the course of a long debate on Parochial Councils, May 12, 1898, the Archbishop said that it was not proposed to exclude Nonconformists from being *ex officio* members of the Council; and that in the May session of the previous year he had been distinctly in favour of the inclusion of women, but the general feeling was the other way.

THE REVISED VERSION

At the same session the Archbishop made some strong remarks about the use and value of the Revised Version. He agreed with the late Lord Selborne that the use of the Authorised Version must have been regularly authorised, and that the record was burned in the fire at the Record Office. He should himself tell any clergyman in his diocese that he might use the Revised Version, and if any one wished to proceed against him he would not allow a prosecution. But, in his opinion, while the Authorised Version was one of the most musical

pieces of English in existence, the Revised Version, especially in the New Testament, was very often exceedingly crabbed, and without any rhythm at all. The Revised Version was full of quite needless alterations, which merely plagued and irritated ordinary readers. The gain in the clearness of St. Paul's Epistles was very great, but even there there were needless alterations, which he was sure ninety-nine persons out of a hundred did not understand at all. He did not think that if left to itself the Revised Version would gradually supersede the Authorised Version.

SUNDAY EDITIONS OF NEWSPAPERS

On April 28, 1899, the Bishop of Rochester (Dr. Talbot) brought before the Upper House the question of the Sunday editions which certain daily newspapers were issuing or proposing to issue. The Archbishop concluded the discussion with some vigorous remarks. The obliteration of the distinction between the Lord's Day and the other days of the week was one of the most serious evils they could possibly contemplate. He did not know anything more likely to damage the religious life of the great body of the people than this. It had long been his practice in confirmation addresses to impress upon the candidates that one of the means provided by God to enable men to persevere in a religious course is the steady observance of the Fourth Commandment. He was not an advocate for a gloomy Sunday. He was very far from desiring to restrain men's liberty beyond what their own consciences required them to practise in the way of restraint. But he felt that public opinion ought in such a country as this to maintain as a very precious treasure the general feeling which now attends the observance of the Lord's Day.

REFORM OF ECCLESIASTICAL COURTS

On February 6, 1900, the Archbishop brought before the Upper House the subject of the reform of the ecclesiastical courts, as the result of discussions in the previous year on a draft Bill then reprinted, as originally presented by Archbishop Benson some ten years before and not proceeded with. He stated that at the joint meeting of the committees of the whole Houses of the two provinces in July 1899 there had been a decided difference in the views taken by the two Convocations on an important point, and also a difference in the views of the Upper and Lower House of the Convocation of York. After the vote on the point in question had been put to the whole body, the northern Convocation had demanded that the votes should be taken separately. The result was that the resolution in question was agreed to by 12 to 7 in the Upper House of Canterbury, and by 65 to 25 in the Lower House; rejected by the majority of the Upper House of York, no member of which body voted for it, though two did not vote either way, and agreed to by 25 to 22 in the Lower House. Thus the resolution was neither accepted nor rejected, the condition of acceptance being that all four Houses were agreed; and this resolution and the three subsequent resolutions, on the reference of a case to the Appeal Committee, were hung up until a definition of the Appeal Committee was agreed to. The Archbishop felt that under these circumstances it was useless for him to draft a Bill for consideration. Parliament had a right to say, "We will listen to the voice of the clergy in their synod if they are really of one mind in the matter, but if the two Convocations are subdivided it is useless to bring it before us. Come to one mind before you ask us to make a change in the

law." After some considerable discussion as to the means for carrying the matter further, the subject dropped.

On January 29, 1902, the Upper House of Canterbury finally adopted resolutions passed by it on July 2, 1901, and concurred in by the Lower House. The only question left for further consideration was the composition of the Provincial Court to hear an appeal from the Diocesan Court of the Archbishop.

VOLUNTARY SCHOOLS

On February 8, 1900, the Archbishop made an address in the Upper House on voluntary schools, stating facts and opinions, some parts of which it is well to put on record, now that the questions then in solution have been dealt with. Three main schemes had been published in the *School Guardian* of December 23, 1899: the Leeds scheme, the Manchester scheme, and the Birmingham scheme. The Leeds scheme, the Archbishop held, would least interfere with the present working of the voluntary schools, and that of course meant that it would be very difficult to carry it. It proposed that the Education Department should be required in all cases to have regard to the religious belief of the parents of the children. This was of course not the case in setting up a board school, where anything of that kind was settled on the spot, without any reference to the Department. Next, it would establish local authorities with power to grant aid from the rates or from Imperial sources, to be administered as the grant-in-aid was now administered. Thirdly, it proposed that the Cowper-Temple clause should be repealed and reasonable arrangements should be made for the separate religious instruction of

the children when requested by a reasonable number of parents. The Manchester scheme proposed to transfer the voluntary schools to local authorities, to be managed by a local committee on which the religious denomination of the transferred schools should be "adequately represented." That would interfere very seriously indeed with the existing system. It proposed to get rid of the trust-deeds, which would be a very rash act. It put the management of the schools, and the appointment and dismissal of teachers, into the hands of a new body, with only the vague proviso that the denomination should be "adequately represented." It made the denomination keep up the buildings of the school. It put the superintendence of the religious instruction in Church schools into the hands of the clergyman of the parish. It would be a very serious risk for the Church to assent to such a scheme. The Birmingham scheme was very wide and general. It divided the country into areas, each having a university at the top of its educational system, secondary schools under the university, and elementary schools at the bottom of the scale. The local authority would be the authority for the whole area, and would have all the powers then in the hands of the Education Department, and would administer all the Imperial grants. All of these three schemes seemed to him to be quite premature.

The Archbishop then proceeded to press the point he perpetually urged, that Church people must give much more money for the thorough support of Church schools in the very fullest educational efficiency, and passed on to speak of the great growth in efficiency within his own educational experience.

On July 3, 1901, the question of what the

Church was prepared to undertake in the upkeep of voluntary schools was coming very near to a solution. The Archbishop pointed out that it had come to a choice between two alternatives. They were assured that the Church could not on the whole undertake the cost of maintaining the buildings, and the cost of paying for the denominational part of the religious teaching in the schools. From a legal point of view, it was safer to take the cost of the buildings; of that there was no doubt. If they had erected the buildings, and if they maintained them in repair, their ownership could not be called in question. On the other hand, he believed it would be easier to get the laity to help with the payment for the denominational part of the religious teaching, all the rest of the teaching, religious and secular, being paid for out of the rates as in board schools. He left it to the House to say which alternative should be chosen.

It is worthy of remark that there is not in the Archbishop's speech the slightest hint of any idea of a conscientious objection on the part of Nonconformists to pay any rate towards Church of England teaching, as the Church of England ratepayer had for thirty years been paying for the Nonconformist teaching.

It is now well known that at the joint meeting of the committees of the two Convocations on the following days it was decided that the Church should undertake the maintenance of the buildings.

On May 2, 1902, the Upper House held a long debate on the Education Bill. On the subject of endowments used for the purposes of elementary education, the Archbishop gave an interesting account of his examination more than thirty years ago of some 600 trust-deeds of old endowments. It was perfectly clear that such as dated from the reign of Edward VI., Elizabeth, and James I. were

not intended for the poor at all. Their purpose was for a certain kind of education, not for a certain class of people. They worked for the poor, because it was held, and held with truth, that there were to be found in the poorer classes of society boys whom it would be well worth while to train for higher positions. The second series of endowments, largely connected with the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, endowments for "charity schools," were intended for schools not for the whole population, but for scholars put in by governors, selected on the ground that they were worthy of a higher education. It was not till the end of the eighteenth century that any idea of providing universal education was formed.

It is of special interest to see what the Archbishop had to say on this critical occasion of the "religious difficulty." He thought that the co-ordination of board schools and voluntary schools, which was certain to follow from the proposals of the Bill, was almost certain to be a very great improvement in both classes of schools. He was very sorry that there should be strife between Church people and Nonconformists, because he was sure that if all other considerations were put aside, and only the efficiency of religious instruction in the schools were taken into account, the Nonconformists would find that it was not in the interest of religion that such a strife should be kept up. With regard to their complaint that some of their money paid to the rates would be used for what is taught in Church schools, he asked in return why Church people should have had to pay rates for religious instruction in board schools, of which in many cases they did not at all approve. They owed as much respect to our consciences as we owed to theirs, and he believed they would come to recognise that, if we took care to use

Christian language in speaking to them and of them.

CANDIDATES FOR HOLY ORDERS

On July 4, 1900, the Archbishop, in summing up a discussion on the comparative dearth of candidates for Holy Orders, compared his early with his recent experience of candidates who came before him. The spiritual character of the candidates had, on the whole, in his judgment distinctly risen since he first became a Bishop. He did not know that the intellectual preparation could in like manner be said to have risen. He could not say, with the Bishop of Hereford, that they had thirty years ago better candidates intellectually than almost any they had now ; but they had then sometimes worse candidates by far than any they have now. In former times when he put before men the view that they ought not to seek ordination unless they conscientiously believed that the work of the ministry was the work which God intended them to do in this present world, they sometimes withdrew their request for ordination. He did not now find that men were staggered when that view was put before them, as time after time they were in his earlier experience as a Bishop. He felt considerable doubt about the wisdom of a resolution before the House to the effect that steps should be taken to bring before the elder boys in public schools the subject of the special vocation of Holy Orders ; he thought that their age made it premature.

At a further discussion on May 8, 1901, the Archbishop maintained that the moral and spiritual character of the men coming from the universities to be ordained was distinctly better than it used to be in his earlier time.

In a discussion on theological colleges (Feb-

ruary 18, 1901) he spoke strongly in preference of larger colleges of this character over smaller.

DILAPIDATIONS

On July 2, 1901, the Archbishop took a leading part in a discussion of Sir A. de B. Porter's scheme for an improvement in the manner of dealing with the large question of ecclesiastical dilapidations. His Grace favoured the principle of the scheme, the main idea of which was that the clergy should insure for the wear and tear of buildings, etc., the Ecclesiastical Commissioners advancing a large capital sum to establish an insurance fund, and the clergy making annual payments to maintain the fund.

AUTHORISATION BY ROYAL WARRANT

On January 28, 1902, the Archbishop made an interesting statement to the House. The Form of Service to be used on the anniversaries of the day of Accession of the Sovereign had been revised by the Convocations of Canterbury and York, and in its revised form had been finally accepted by the Convocations. The Form thus agreed to had been submitted by him, through the Home Office, to the King. He believed at the time he sent it in that it would require an Order in Council to make it valid as a Service that the clergy were to use. But he found that was not the mode in which the proposals of Convocation were dealt with. The King could authorise by Royal Warrant the Service submitted to him by the Convocations, and had accordingly issued his Warrant for the observance of the Service. The Archbishop proposed to inquire further into the nature and character of these warrants, for it was clear that a good deal of the work of Convocation might be facilitated if

proposals coming from both Convocations were treated as having sufficient authority to justify the Sovereign, if so disposed, in issuing a Royal Warrant for their acceptance.

MARRIAGE WITH A DECEASED WIFE'S SISTER

On January 29, 1902, the Bishop of London (Dr. Winnington Ingram) proposed a resolution of protest against the proposal to allow marriage with a deceased wife's sister.

One of the bishops having spoken of the Scriptural argument as relying upon Leviticus xviii. 18, the Archbishop declared in favour of the argument from Scripture, but could not see that the verse quoted was applicable to the case. The general principle of all restraints upon marriages, whether of consanguinity or of affinity, was laid down in the sixth verse of the same chapter. Throughout the Old Testament, when the duty involved in rules of marriage is spoken of, it is the duty of the man that is laid down, not of the woman. There are individual instances of the transgressions of women, but generally the woman is left out of sight. When we come to the New Testament there is a complete change in that important particular. Our Lord speaks of a man committing adultery "against a woman"; in the Old Testament a man's adultery is committed against the husband of the woman. This marks certainly a very great change in the moral law regulating the relations of men and women. St. Paul, in writing to the Corinthians, puts the man and the woman on the same level. That being the Christian rule, we should turn to the 16th verse of Lev. xviii., not the 18th, and apply to its direct command the New Testament parity of woman and man, and then the argument that Scripture—that is, the New Testament—for-

bids marriage with a deceased wife's sister is found to be valid. It had been argued in favour of such marriage that it was common in America, and that the moral tone of society was as good as here. Bishop Phillips Brooks had held that argument with him when he was in London. His reply had been, "How many divorces are there in America as compared with England?" Divorce was far easier there than here, and he held that the prevalence of divorce was a quite certain mark that the sanctity of marriage had been lowered in the eyes of the people. If the proposed law passed, he believed that the idea of marriage would be lowered, for a time perhaps imperceptibly, but certainly.

THE DEATH OF DR. TEMPLE

At the first meeting of the Upper House after the death of Dr. Temple, under the presidency of the new Archbishop (Dr. Davidson), the Bishop of London (Dr. Winnington Ingram) proposed a resolution expressive of the deep loss sustained by the House and the Church, the keynotes of the resolution and of the admirable speech in support of it being the "directness" and the "sympathy" of the late Archbishop. The resolution was supported by the Bishops of Chichester (Dr. Wilberforce), Llandaff (Dr. Lewis), Southwell (Dr. Ridding), Peterborough (Dr. Glyn), Exeter (Dr. Robertson), Hereford (Dr. Percival), Bath and Wells (Dr. Kennion), Bristol (Dr. Browne); and indeed all the bishops present would fain have spoken, if time had permitted. The President, in putting the resolution, spoke in the most feeling and felicitous manner of the power and charm of his predecessor, and mourned "the passing hence of incomparably the greatest figure in the Church."

CHAPTER VIII

THE HOUSE OF LORDS

Contagious diseases—A Sunday Bill—Suffragan Bishops Bill—Education—Benefices Bill—Irregularities in public worship—Prayer for the dead—Temperance—Marriage Act Amendment Bill—Burial Bill—The Sovereign's declaration—Factory and workshops.

CONTAGIOUS DISEASES

ON May 14, 1897, the Archbishop made an important speech on a motion by the Earl of Dunraven for an inquiry into the effect of contagious diseases upon the forces of the Crown, the civil population, and the native races within Her Majesty's dominions. Lord Roberts having spoken with urgent force of the need of such inquiry, the Archbishop remarked that there was one class of consideration which had not received full attention in either of the speeches—it was quite certain they could not get to the root of such an evil as that under discussion, without giving a great deal of attention to the moral side of the question. The old regulations had no doubt given to the soldier the impression that the purpose of the Government was not to stamp the sin as an evil, but only to stop the effects of it. The authorities ought to make it clear that they looked upon this kind of indulgence as a very evil thing, to be condemned by every good man and by every good soldier.

The mischief was kept up by barrack-room conversation and by the way in which the men regarded the sin; as long as that was so, they could not have the co-operation of the men themselves, and without such co-operation no class of men could be raised to a higher level. They ought to get at men's consciences and their habits of life. To allow many more of them to marry would cost a great deal of money, but not as much as the present evil cost. More should be done in the way of agreeable and interesting occupation for the soldier's idle moments. An inquiry which looked into that side of the matter with as much care as medical men naturally bestowed upon the material inquiry would really be of great benefit. He expressed his strong sense of deep gratitude to those who had brought the subject before them.

A SUNDAY BILL

On June 29, 1897, Lord Hobhouse moved the second reading of a Sunday Bill. The Bishop of Winchester (Dr. Davidson) having spoken against the motion, and Earl Cowper for it, the Archbishop spoke strongly against the second reading. It was quite plain that the Bill contemplated the possibility of the formation of associations for Sunday lectures and Sunday entertainments of a character altogether inconsistent with the character of Sunday. They had to ask, What was the check that was to be put on these entertainments? The check was, that they were to be undertaken for the public good and not by way of trade or for the pecuniary profit of the promoters. It was contrary to their experience of the way in which trade pushed itself into everything, to rely upon such a check; there would be a gradual declension of the entertainments into the form which one part

of the Bill sought to prevent. A musician who refused to sing on Sundays would soon be passed over on week-days by employers, who would engage men willing to sing on seven days of the week. Promoters could easily plead that they did not want profit but only reasonable payment for services rendered, and under that shield profit could be made under the Bill. One thing, and one thing only, could make the Bill safe in this respect. Instead of saying "provided the proceedings are undertaken with a view to the public good," they should say "provided that no payment whatever is allowed to be made by those who attend the entertainments"; then they would know where they were. He had been flooded with letters from artisans in all parts of England begging him to oppose the Bill; and he knew enough of the working-men of London to be quite certain that very considerable numbers of them who were really religious people would earnestly deprecate the passing of any such Bill. But he would not rest his opposition only on what religious persons might feel; there was a real danger that if amusement-lovers gained the day, profit-lovers would follow, and the observance of Sunday as a day of rest would be very seriously imperilled. He did not object to Sunday lectures as such; but to allow such work as the Bill proposed to go on for payment would break down the observance of Sunday more than anything else they could do. The Bill was rejected by fifty to thirty-three, the Archbishop and five Bishops voting in the majority.

SUFFRAGAN BISHOPS BILL .

On March 11, 1898, the Archbishop moved the second reading of the Suffragan Bishops Bill. The Act of Henry VIII. provided that a Diocesan

Bishop might nominate to the Crown two persons of whom the Crown might select one and order his consecration as a Suffragan Bishop. This technically precluded the nomination of a person already consecrated. The Archbishop pointed out that precedents had been established for bringing back to England Colonial Bishops to become Diocesan Bishops, and urged that it might be of much advantage to a Diocesan Bishop to nominate as Suffragan a Colonial Bishop whether acting or retired.

It is of real value in the present day to bind Colonial Churches with the Churches at home as closely as possible. No one can help feeling that whatever tends to the unity of the Empire is a thing to be very much desired on all accounts, and the unity of the Church of England is a very strong link to bind the Colonies to the unity of the whole Empire.

The Bill became law.

EDUCATION

On March 30, 1897, the Archbishop welcomed in the House of Lords the Voluntary Schools Bill which had come up from the Commons. In the course of his speech he described his proposals for the constitution of the Associations which under the provisions of the Bill the managers of voluntary schools were to be enabled to form. When the Bill became an Act, these proposals were carried out, and during the five years to which the operation of the Act was limited, the Associations thus constituted proved to be most efficient. They taught the advantages of combination; and when the five years came to an end, and the Act of 1902 with all its difficulties had to be worked, the Associations afforded a useful machinery for the assistance and protection of Church schools. In

his speech on the second reading of the Bill of 1897, the Archbishop spoke with his wonted passionate earnestness of the sacrifices made by the clergy for the maintenance of the schools, and of the intolerable pressure of the expense of ever-increasing demands for additional accommodation and enlarged curriculum. With equal earnestness he spoke of the necessity of retaining the appointment of teachers who were to give religious instruction.

The managers of the Church schools cannot afford to give up the appointment of the teachers, which is their one guarantee that the religious instruction shall be such in quality as they themselves desire. It has been very often asked, "Why should you not prescribe the religious instruction to be given, and then leave it to the master to give it, without taking any pains to find out whether he himself believes in it or not? He may not believe in what you Churchmen think a fundamental article of faith, but he may teach that article though he does not believe it." Yes, he may; he may get the children to pass a good examination upon all these various points of doctrine; but what is the examination worth if meanwhile it appears that the children have imbibed from him a disbelief in one of the fundamental principles on which he has to teach? There is no question about it that if the teacher does not believe what he is put there to teach, it has not the effect upon the children that we desire to produce, in the slightest degree. When I was at Rugby I had to teach all that boys ought to know in order to study classical books about Jupiter, Juno, Apollo, Mars, and all the other divinities with which in those days we were familiar. But, my Lords, I should not like the Christian religion to be taught in the same way, because I will answer for it the boys who had instruction in that way from me did not believe that Jupiter, Juno, Mars, or Apollo were existent deities at one time, who governed as the writers of classical literature supposed. If we are to teach in that fashion, I would rather leave religious instruction out.

On April 24, 1899, the Board of Education Bill was read a second time. The Archbishop "rejoiced

exceedingly" at the appearance of the Bill, and earnestly hoped it might become an Act as soon as possible; but there were features in it which did not meet with his approval. He was bound to have regard to the question of religious education, not because he claimed any special treatment for the Church of England as distinct from any other religious body, but because he feared lest under the guise of "religious equality" religious education should be excluded from public recognition and left to the operation of chance forces. (1) He objected to the proposed transfer of practically uncontrolled power over educational endowments of under £50 a year from the Charity Commissioners, a judicial or semi-judicial body, to a political department such as the new Board must be. Many of such endowments were for elementary education, and there would be a very considerable temptation to transfer them to the purposes of secondary education. (2) The inspection clause needed careful attention. It was not clear who was to pay for the inspection, or whether private schools would be included. It would be a serious mistake, in a new system of secondary education, to ignore the private schools. They would continue to exist, and they had better be good schools than bad schools. In his own experience of the thirty years since he sat on the Schools Inquiry Commission, there had been great improvements in private secondary schools, and a great many of them were now really very good schools and ought to be encouraged. (3) It ought also to be seen to that schools which give religious instruction should be able to get inspection on the same terms exactly as those which do not; they ought neither to be excluded nor to be fined by being made to pay where the others did not. In passing he referred to the great public schools; these were admittedly the very best schools of their

kind, because they formed character and sent out into the world young men of high principles. When it was considered what effect a real religious education of the best kind had upon the formation of character, it would be seen that to put obstacles in its way would do more harm to the future generations of the country than they would do good by making the intellectual teaching better than it was at present. (4) The consultative committee seemed, on the whole, to be likely to be useful, but it would need careful watching. There seemed a little tendency to make it a committee of experts, and he confessed to being always a little afraid of uncontrolled experts; there should be on the committee some who took an interest in education in the sense of seeing quite clearly what they wanted to get out of it. And while it was well that the Minister should be thus brought into touch with leading men who know a great deal about the matter, the President should not allow his own responsibility to be hid behind the committee as a kind of shelter. (5) Clause 5 required that any Order under the Act should be laid before each House of Parliament for not less than four weeks of Session; but it did not give Parliament power to reject it, and either House should have that power.

On May 2, 1899, the Government inserted words retaining the power of rejection by a resolution of both Houses under the Endowed Schools Acts and others. The Archbishop moved that either House separately should have that power. The Lord President refused to assent to this, and his Grace withdrew it.

On July 23, 1900, the second reading of the Education Bill of 1900 was moved by the Lord President (the Duke of Devonshire). The Archbishop expressed his opinion that the schemes for

the appointment of educational committees should be laid before Parliament, or at least that a clearer statement of the principles which were to govern such appointment should be given in the Bill. He repeated his previous strong remarks in favour of a careful preservation of the religious teaching in secondary schools. He objected to a conscience clause in the boarding-houses of schools and colleges, where the students ought to be treated as if they were at home; but he thought a conscience clause quite fair for such students of schools and colleges as were not in boarding-houses. He had not the slightest desire to prevent the Bill becoming law, but he thought it came twenty years too late.

THE BENEFICES BILL.

On July 7, 1898, the debate on the second reading of the Benefices Bill took place in the House of Lords. The Archbishop expressed his earnest wish that the Bill could have gone further in forbidding the sale of advowsons, but was grateful that it went so far as it did. He spoke incidentally of his satisfaction with the manner in which land-owners exercised their rights of patronage. On two points of importance he spoke strongly against proposals of the Bill or of amendments moved. One of these points was the imposition of costs upon a bishop who refused to institute to a benefice a clergyman whom he declared on defined grounds to be unfit; to which the Prime Minister, Lord Salisbury, replied that unless some means of payment of expenses were provided, this part of the Bill would become a dead letter. The other point was the constitution of new means of appeal, in one case from the Archbishop of one province to the Archbishop of another, in another case from an Archbishop to his Suffragans. He urged as a

principle to be carefully maintained that "in all these matters, when you are dealing with a Church which goes back so many centuries, it is of real importance that you should, if possible, make the clergy feel that the machinery used is machinery of a kind which harmonises with all the traditions of the Church in the past."

IRREGULARITIES IN PUBLIC WORSHIP

On February 9, 1899, the Bishop of Winchester (Dr. Davidson) opened a discussion in the House of Lords by calling attention to statements made at a meeting in the Albert Hall respecting the action of bishops in dealing with irregularities in public worship. Lord Kinnaird, to whom the Bishop had made special reference as chairman of the meeting at the Albert Hall, having spoken, followed by the Bishop of London (Dr. Creighton), the Earl of Harrowby, Viscount Halifax, the Earl of Portsmouth, the Earl of Cranbrook, the Bishop of Ripon (Dr. Carpenter), and the Earl of Kimberley, the Archbishop brought the discussion to a close.

His Grace remarked that the agitation among the laity—especially the educated laity—was due rather to a fear of Romanist doctrine than to dislike of ceremonial. As regarded doctrine, he did not think there had been any remissness on the part of the bishops. He had himself when Bishop of London never passed over a case of the Invocation of Saints or the Worship of the Virgin. But he must point out that in doctrine the Church of England was very comprehensive, and that a wide range of doctrine had been declared allowable in the Church by decisions of the Supreme Court of Appeal, the Court of Privy Council. The agitation being in his judgment due to the belief that there was a great deal of Romanism in the

Church of England, he ventured to say, after taking a good deal of pains to ascertain the feeling underlying the ritual, that the amount of anything like Romanism was exceedingly small. In the vast majority of cases, the clergy who were indulging in ritual irregularities had no desire whatever to join the Church of Rome themselves or get others to join that Church. The mischief of ritual excesses, and of the use of such terms as "the Mass," which in itself did not convey anything wrong, was that they accustomed people to usages like those of Rome, and thus weak people found it easier to slip over the border than it would otherwise have been. Ritual irregularities must be carefully watched, and stopped when they exceeded the law; but it must be remembered that the bishops had to look to the purpose for which the Church exists, namely, to bring people to the foot of the Cross. When a man was a devoted servant of the Lord, devoted to his primary duty of winning souls, and at the same time using ceremonial beyond the ordinary limits, great delicacy and care were needed in interfering with his work. It was Archbishop Tait who carried the Public Worship Regulation Act, and yet it was he who stopped the prosecution of Father Lowder, saying, "I looked into the man's work, and I could not go on with any prosecution or allow it." As so much care was needed, he thought the bishops should be allowed a sufficiency of time; change could not be effected in a hurry. A previous speaker had asked for an explanation of the nature of the "hearing" which the archbishops had proposed. The Prayer Book bade recourse to be had to the bishops and archbishops in cases of doubt as to the manner in which the services were to be conducted. It was natural that the clergy should wish to be heard on their side, and it was wisdom to accede to that wish. The bishops

desired willing, not compulsory, obedience. They wished to have the clergy with them in any changes which might appear necessary. Not menace but conciliation was the proper spirit in which the clergy should be approached. Every means should be tried before resort to those harsh measures with which the Courts of Law supplied the bishops. The laity had their rights, and the bishops were not indifferent to the right of the laity to have the services which the Church's law provides.

On July 16, 1900, the Earl of Portsmouth called attention in the House of Lords to "the continued lawlessness in the Church of England," in view of the alleged absence of practical effect from the finding of the archbishops on incense, processional lights, and reservation. The Archbishop denied that the finding on incense and lights had been generally disregarded; on the contrary, the great majority of those who had used incense ceremonially during public worship "had already conformed to what the bishops had urged upon them." He believed that in time a like effect would be produced on men's minds by the finding on reservation; and did not think it would be well for the Church if any violent means were used at the present time to compel obedience. No doubt some of the clergy held opinions on the subject of the Holy Communion which went far in the direction of Roman Catholic doctrine, but he believed that with very few exceptions there was a distinction, real and deep, though not clear to those who had not seriously studied the complicated and difficult question. As regarded the absence on some occasions of communicants, it was easy to guard against that 200 years ago, when no one communicated who had not sent notice of his intention to communicate, but very difficult now,

when that practice was completely abandoned. On such questions as the Presence in the consecrated elements, many of the clergy who kept within the formularies of the Church in the broad sense, as interpreted by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, would still be held by the great majority of Lord Portsmouth's adherents as altogether offending against the Church's law. In the great decisions in the Gorham case in one direction, long ago, and in the Bennett case in the other direction, at a later date, the supreme tribunal had pronounced in favour of the very widest liberty, and "to say that men are not open to accept the liberty thus opened before them is altogether inconsistent with the position which any party in the Church of England has a right to claim." He believed that if they were left to deal with the whole matter as Bishops of the Church, they would be able to do, quietly but not so rapidly as many would desire, all that was really necessary to be done.

PRAYERS FOR THE DEAD

On March 9, 1900, the Archbishop was asked in the House by Lord Kinnaird "whether any precedent can be found since the Reformation Settlement was enacted by the passing of 1 Eliz. capp. 1, 2, in which prayers for the dead have ever been introduced 'by authority'?" This was in connexion with special prayers issued for use during the war in South Africa.

His Grace replied that the number of prayers issued by the authority of the Crown was too great to make it possible without much labour to give an exact answer to the question. But he had found two of these documents, dated December 19, 1797, and November 29, 1798, issued in like manner

for use in the then war, in which the following words occur :—

And for those whom in this righteous cause Thy Providence permits to fall, receive, we pray Thee, their souls to Thy mercy.

These words, the Archbishop maintained, came as near as words non-identical could come to the words recently issued :—

And for all those who have fallen, that they with us may enter into that rest which Thou hast prepared for those who believe in Thee.

After discussing the general question raised by these latter words, the Archbishop proceeded to point out that, though prayers for the dead had been struck out from the ordinary services, it was quite certain that the law had decided that such prayers are not outside the limits of the law. That decision had been acquiesced in for sixty years. The principle of the decision was that which underlay the decision in the case of Mr. Bennett, whom the judges refused to condemn, because the doctrine which he taught was not prohibited by the Church of England. Of course those who were under the Canons had made a promise that they would keep within the limits of the Prayer Book, and they could therefore not—without further authority—offer such prayer in the services of the Church. The Church of England could very easily have forbidden prayer for the dead in the 22nd Article, and it had not done so. The present was a great and special occasion. Sorrowing souls were praying for loved ones out in the war. At such a time it was right to practise toleration. Further, there were five different forms of prayer appointed for use, and this was only one of the five; no one need use it who did not wish to do

so. With the question whether the Privy Council has any right to issue such prayers at all he had nothing to do. It had long been the ordinary way of issuing such prayers. The prayers were issued as having lawful authority, and they had to be taken as lawfully issued. Only a court of law could decide whether in fact they were lawfully issued.

TEMPERANCE

On May 18, 1900, the Bishop of Winchester (Dr. Davidson) moved that legislative effect should be given to such recommendations as were common to the Majority and Minority Reports of the Royal Commission on the Liquor Licensing Laws. The Prime Minister (the Marquis of Salisbury) having opposed the motion, and Viscount Peel (the chairman of the Royal Commission) having supported it so far as it went, while denying that it could be accepted as a final settlement, the Archbishop replied with some severity to the speech of the Prime Minister. Lord Salisbury, he said, had discussed every point exactly as if the Report or Reports had nothing to do with him or the Government, when, as a matter of fact, the Commission was issued by Lord Salisbury and his Government. "The noble Marquis said over and over again that all these various proposals require very careful consideration. What were the Commissioners doing all through the three years during which they sat? They were giving these questions the most careful consideration." "The noble Marquis tells us now that we must not have legislation without most careful consideration—as if we had not given long and careful consideration to all these points. It seems to me that this is not quite the way in which a Royal Commission ought to be

treated. I do not deny that when you come to legislate you will have to consider every one of these points very carefully ; but the very beginning of such consideration must be some distinct attempt at legislation." He urged that there was strong reason why they should not wait. They were doing much more than merely permitting drunkenness ; they were really sowing the seed for greater drunkenness afterwards. "The hereditary character of a great deal of the drunkenness lays a heavy responsibility on those who are postponing, postponing, and postponing all attempts to remedy this state of things." He had of course signed the Minority Report, and he much preferred it ; but they would at any rate gain by adopting so much as was common to the two Reports, that is, so much as could justly be called the unanimous view of the Commission of the Government's own appointment. An amendment suggested by the Archbishop having been agreed to, and the amended resolution being before the House, Lord Salisbury objected to what had now, in his judgment, been turned round practically into a vote of want of confidence being put without notice. It was contrary to the practice of the House to do that, and if the amended motion was carried, he should not accept the decision as the decision of the House, "because it will have been obtained by craft." Lord Rosebery having protested against this doctrine, the Archbishop, evidently enjoying the position, said that though he had proposed this amendment he had not at all lost his confidence in Lord Salisbury's Government. Lord Salisbury's retort was in Dr. Temple's own most characteristic manner : "The most reverend Prelate may most kindly say what he likes, but what I care for is what he does." The division was a close one. Including fourteen spiritual peers and one or two

supporters of the Government, 42 voted for the motion ; against the motion, 45 temporal peers.

Soon after this debate there was a meeting of the Governors of the Charterhouse in one of the House of Lords Committee Rooms, the Archbishop in the chair. A number of resolutions had passed, but one more governor was required to make a quorum. A messenger was sent to fetch another governor from the House, which was sitting. Lord Salisbury appeared. "Well, my Lord," said the Archbishop, "we have passed these resolutions, but needed your presence to make our action valid." "But what if I disapprove of what you have done, now that I am here?" "Oh, there will be a division, and we shall outvote you." "That would give your Grace a double pleasure. But what if I go away again at once?" "It won't make any difference; a quorum once constituted cannot be destroyed. So we hope you will sign the resolutions." "How tyrannical you are!" said Lord Salisbury, as he signed.

On August 16, 1901, on the second reading of the Sale of Intoxicating Liquors to Children Bill, the Archbishop welcomed the Bill cordially, and hoped that it might be passed into law with all convenient speed. He believed that it would do more for the good of the children than anything else the House could do for them. He regretted that certain amendments had taken away some part of its efficiency, but even as it stood the Bill was an exceedingly useful one, and he believed that it would have a very beneficial effect. The Bill became law.

In the next session, on February 27, 1902, the Archbishop spoke very briefly on the second reading of the Public Houses (Scotland) Bill, asking for more light, and proposing to refer the Bill to a select committee, that they might have something

to go upon in deciding how they should ultimately vote. The suggestion was disregarded, and a vote was immediately taken on the second reading, which was lost by 60 to 37. The Archbishop and four Bishops voted in the minority for the second reading.

In the discussion in Committee (July 21) on the Licensing Bill of 1902, the Archbishop only said a few words. He voted in each of the two divisions taken, and in each case in the minority. In the first case it was moved to omit some words which were thought unduly to protect grocers' licences: the Archbishop and five bishops voted in the minority of 38 for their removal, against 53 temporal peers. In the second case it was proposed by amendment to prevent a magistrate's clerk from acting as solicitor in respect of applications for licences, not in his own district only, as to which there was agreement, but also in districts adjoining that in which he acted as clerk. The Archbishop and four bishops voted in the minority of 23 for the additional restriction, against 62 temporal peers.

MARRIAGE ACT AMENDMENT

On June 13, 1900, the Archbishop moved the second reading of a Marriage Act Amendment Bill, containing many useful provisions. The Lord Chancellor (the Earl of Halsbury) did not propose to reject the Bill, but reserved the right to criticise it in Committee. It was read a second time, and the Archbishop then moved to negative the Standing Committee. This was objected to and withdrawn. In Committee the Lord Chancellor stated that the Bill was drawn with so little care that he would not take the responsibility of trying to amend it. To this the Archbishop replied that the Bill was exactly as it left the House nine years

before, on May 12, 1891, when Lord Halsbury had taken part in the discussion and had supported the Bill. In the only division taken, on a question of the form of publication of banns, the temporal peers were equally divided, 18 to 18, and 11 spiritual peers carried the motion against the Government. The Bill was not proceeded with.

BURIAL GROUNDS BILL

On June 26, 1900, the day on which the division mentioned in the previous paragraph was taken, the Archbishop warmly welcomed the Burial Grounds Bill based on the Report of a Commission presided over by Sir Richard Jebb, M.P. for the University of Cambridge. He doubted whether it would be possible to make a better arrangement than that proposed by the Bill, while not doubting that there would be difference of opinion. The Bill became law.

THE SOVEREIGN'S DECLARATION

On July 3, 1901, the Report of a Committee of the House of Lords on the Sovereign's Declaration against Transubstantiation was before the House. The Lord Chancellor (Earl of Halsbury) having "repudiated the responsibility of moving that the report be now considered," the Archbishop moved "that the report be referred back to the Committee for further consideration, and that the Committee be enlarged by the appointment of additional members," without explaining in what respects the Declaration proposed by the Committee was unsatisfactory. Lord Salisbury having argued that unless the motion was made definite by a statement of the grounds on which the report

was referred back, the Committee would not know what they were expected to do, and several peers having spoken, the Archbishop abstained from saving "content" when his motion was put. The subject then dropped, the Lord Chancellor intimating that a Bill would be drafted and introduced.

On July 23, 1901, the Royal Declaration Bill, prepared in accordance with the above intimation, was read a second time. The Archbishop and three bishops, with 92 temporal peers, voted for the second reading, six temporal peers voted against it. Notwithstanding the very large majority, "everybody," Lord Rosebery said, and Lord Salisbury agreed, "was in the main against the Bill." The Archbishop believed that longer consideration might have produced a better declaration than that before the House, and "did not like the form of the statement very much." But he voted for the Bill because it was necessary to "stand quite firm to this—that a body which owes allegiance to a foreign power cannot be allowed to exercise its authority, claiming, as it does, to be an infallible authority; it is impossible for this country to allow such an authority to exercise such power as it might exercise through a Sovereign who was under such obligations."

On August 1, 1901, in committee, the Archbishop seconded a motion by Lord Rosebery to refer the Bill to a select committee. He thought the proposed form of declaration was not to the credit of the House, and should not be put on the statute-book. The motion was lost by 105 to 20, the Archbishop and four bishops voting in the minority, and one bishop with the majority. On the occasion of the third reading of the Bill, on August 5, 1901, the Archbishop did not intervene in the discussion.

FACTORY AND WORKSHOPS ACTS

On the discussion of the Factory and Workshops Acts, etc., Bill, at a very late period in the session of 1901, namely, on August 15, the Archbishop strongly pressed the acceptance by the House of an amendment proposed by Lord Windsor, in the interest of women working in laundries in reformatories. It was argued that to introduce such an amendment would mean the loss of the Bill, for the amendment would not be accepted by the House of Commons. The Archbishop maintained that the Government could pass the clause through the Commons if it chose to undertake to do so. The amendment dropped after a complicated debate, and the Bill was passed and returned to the Commons without the clause.

CHAPTER IX

QUEEN VICTORIA AND KING EDWARD VII

Sermon on the Queen's eightieth birthday at St. Paul's—Death of Queen Victoria—Speech in the House of Lords—Sermon in St. Paul's—St. Botolph's—Croydon—The Coronation of King Edward VII.

ON the Queen's eightieth birthday, May 24, 1899, a great Service of 'Thanksgiving' was held at St. Paul's Cathedral. The Archbishop preached the sermon on the text, "In all their affliction He was afflicted" (Isa. lxiii. 9). He pointed out that there had been through successive ages a perpetual progress in the character of the human race, especially since the Gospel came into the world. And yet it was impossible to say that in all respects the world was better than it was before. They could not say that the world had grown in faith, the highest thing. He did not think they could say that there was more of high principle now than there was ages ago; that men were less prone to depart from high principle in presence of great temptation; that the power of great temptation was less. There was still as much of fraud, of meanness, of disregard of truth; perhaps more. But there was one thing that had made and was making steady progress, leavening all mankind, making men in one sense higher and better than they were before, and that was the power of sympathy between man and man. This

power tended to remove barriers, even religious barriers, the most obstinate. It tended to discredit war. In the providence of God, this was one of the powers that was to regenerate mankind. Throughout the reign of Queen Victoria, one of the great blessings conferred by the reign had been the example of a woman's sympathy, the sympathy of a genuine and true woman with all that touched her people. Was there any distress among her people which did not at once call forth some expression of sympathy from that queenly heart? Was there any joy that she knew greater than the joy of knowing that her love for her people was answered by their love for her? Was it not evident that she was the representative of sympathy in this land? It was for this reason that the mention of her name always brought a thrill to our hearts. It was good that we should thank God for all He had conferred upon us in giving us such a ruler.

On Friday, January 25, 1901, the House of Lords met to receive a message from the King on the death of Queen Victoria. The Prime Minister (Lord Salisbury) and the Leader of the Opposition (Lord Kimberley) having, in words which should never be forgotten, paid tribute to the remarkable power and charm of the late Queen, the Archbishop rose, and, with all the deep emotion of a strong man moved to the very limits of self-control, delivered an unstudied speech, which led one of those present to say to him, "Well, your Grace, you made us all cry":—

My Lords, I desire to be allowed to say a few words upon this matter as representing the Church of England, which, as your Lordships are aware, is connected by closer ties with the Sovereign in this country than in almost any other. For myself, it is impossible to look back over Her Majesty's reign without a deep sense of gratitude to God for having given us

such a Sovereign to reign over us, a Sovereign whose powers of statesmanship and powers of advising those who had the government in their hands have been already spoken of, but whose influence as a woman, and, I may add, as a truly religious woman, was far greater than anything which could be exercised by the wisest statesman or the cleverest administrator. Her influence, the character of her Court, the character of the domestic life of which her subjects were allowed to know something, had a penetrating power which reached far beyond the possibility of our being able to trace it. There can be no question that all society has been the better because the Queen has reigned. There cannot be a question that it has been a blessing to very very many who knew not from whom the blessing flowed. Thousands upon thousands, I have no doubt at all, are living better lives, although they know not the reason, simply because there was such a Sovereign on the throne, a Sovereign who gave the people all her intellectual powers, who gave the people all her extraordinary knowledge of what affected their interests, but who also gave the people her very heart. We can never forget the loving sympathy with which on all occasions she spoke to those who needed such sympathy, the words by which she made us all feel that she cared for every one of us, the readiness with which she responded to every call made upon her as not only a woman, but a loving woman amongst her people whose love she longed to win. The influence which such a Sovereign exercised it would be difficult to find anywhere in the history that is past. It would be difficult to find the equal of it; it would be impossible to find anything that could surpass it. She was a religious woman. She prayed for her people. She was a good woman. She set up a true standard of such lives as Christians ought to live. She made us all feel that we were hers and she desired to be ours; and so throughout the country good people are lamenting her departure. Throughout the country I do not think there is a single heart that is not penetrated by a sense of gratitude that God has given us such a Queen; and we look forward and we trust that the influence which she exercised will not die with her. We trust that the Sovereign who has succeeded her will follow in her footsteps as he has told us he means to do; and whilst sorrow seems at this moment stronger than any other feeling, we are yet able to add to that sorrow an expression of true loyalty towards the Sovereign who has succeeded.

On Sunday, January 27, the Archbishop preached at St. Paul's on the death of Queen Victoria. He took for his text Revelation xiv. 13, "Blessed are the dead which die in the Lord from henceforth: Yea, saith the Spirit, that they may rest from their labours."

The Queen (he said) had lived a life of toil, if man or woman ever did. She laboured for the good of her people with incessant assiduity, and never flinched from whatever duty called her to do. And why? That she might accomplish the great aim which she did accomplish. She was a constitutional monarch, and to some minds a constitutional monarchy was an impossibility. The people have a will and the monarch has a will, and so it is argued that the monarch either does nothing or interferes with the will of the free people. The Queen solved that problem, for the great good of this and of other countries. She began by making herself acquainted with everything that concerned her subjects. She toiled day and night that she might do this. She knew that the people must be governed by those whom they had themselves chosen to be her ministers. By her thorough knowledge she was able always to press upon her ministers her own opinion of the course it was right to pursue; having made that perfectly clear, beyond mistake, she recognised that it rested with them, as a duty and a responsibility, to take the course they thought best for the country, whether it was the course she herself preferred or not. She recognised that though it should prove that the ministers were wrong and she was right, it was better in the end for the real freedom of the people that the course preferred by the ministers should be followed; better that, than that even though she was perfectly right her opinion should overrule the clear opinion of the representatives of the people. And so it was that before all the world she solved the problem which many had supposed to be insoluble. And outside constitutional questions she felt that she had, and she exercised, complete freedom of speech and action. Can anything better in the way of government ever be found than her messages to her own people, her soldiers, her sailors, her colonies? She ruled by sympathy and love. That was how she astonished her ministers at times by the certainty with which she knew what the people would think and would say of some course

which it was decided to pursue. The explanation was simple ; it came from the sagacity which is born of sympathy more than from inherent talent. A powerful mind indeed she had ; but in her actions and her words men lost sight of the power in the greatness and truth of the marvellous sympathy. For such a blessing as this God be thanked, a blessing almost unparalleled in the whole history of the world.

The Archbishop was engaged to preach at St. Botolph's, Aldersgate, on Wednesday, January 30, at the City of London celebration of the bicentenary of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts. The death of Queen Victoria of necessity occupied the thoughts of every one, and the Primate showed in a felicitous manner how closely the Queen's life and reign were connected with the original purpose of his sermon :—

The growth of the British Empire was of itself a call to preach the Gospel. They were marked out by the providence of God to preach the Resurrection to all the world. And the personal life and example of the great Queen gave a special force to their efforts. She was, as those who came near her saw, a deeply religious Christian. She felt the truth she had learned from the teaching of the Christian Church, she felt it from her very soul. She prayed for her people, she prayed for all in her service, she never forgot them day by day. Never in history would you find such a record of a people thrilled through and through by the sense of their love to one whom they had lost, and of their gratitude to God for having made her His instrument of blessing. For what blessings had been brought into this land by the quiet, the unremitting, the religious and the loving labours of the Sovereign who had so long ruled over us. The Lord is calling us, is calling us with a powerful voice. The Lord is speaking to our very hearts and souls. The Lord himself is bidding us to go on in the path that shall best show our reverence for goodness, our gratitude for love. The Lord is bidding us prove to all the nations of the world that this country has not received in vain blessings, that have never before been bestowed on any other nation in so marvellous a degree and in so marvellous a manner.

On Sunday, February 30, the Archbishop was engaged to preach in the afternoon at Croydon Parish Church, at a service for men only. He took as his text Hebrews v. 14, and illustrated its lessons by reference to the Queen's sense of duty :—

She became (he said), as she went on through life, wonderfully skilled in true statesmanship; she had a marvellous instinct; towards the end of her life it became more marvellous still. She knew what was good for her people, what touched their hearts, what it was they were really caring for. Her Ministers were astonished at the extraordinary power she showed of understanding her people. And yet she was not a woman of naturally very strong understanding. She learned it all from her love for her people; it came out of her full sympathy with them. She made it a rule that all that concerned her people should come before her own hand. No despatch went from this country to any foreign Court that she had not seen, criticised, judged, and, if necessary, modified; and often the ministers responsible for the despatch found in the end from what she had saved the country. It was well known how she saved the country from war with the United States. She yielded to the views of her Ministers when they could not be persuaded by what she said, because she thought that was best for her people, whose representatives they were. But she warned them at times that they would themselves, in the light of experience, change their minds, and they found that her warning came true.

The Coronation of King Edward the Seventh and Queen Alexandra was fixed to take place on Thursday, June 26, 1902. On account of the illness of the King it was of necessity put off, and it eventually was carried out, with some curtailment of the lengthy service, on August 9.

The form of service as originally issued had been long and carefully considered. In this consideration the aged Archbishop, now in his eighty-first year, had taken his full part. To enter upon such alterations as were introduced would be out of place here.

Besides the form to be used at the Coronation itself, a "Form and Order of Service recommended for use in the Churches of the Church of England on the Coronation Day" was issued by command of the King, and the issue of this form led to a considerable amount of controversy, some of the clergy declining to use it. The point of objection was the employment of the phrase "the Protestant Reformed Religion established by Law," the use of which phrase had a curious beginning. The full phrase, as originally used, was, "the Liturgy of the Reformed Church of England as established by Law," *i.e.* the Liturgy established by Law, not the Church established by Law.

In order to render this service as far as might be a representation of the service actually being carried out in the Abbey Church of Westminster, the officiating clergy in the several churches throughout England were instructed to make an address to the congregation at a special part of the service, describing what was being done at the Abbey. An objection was made to this on the ground that the Act of Uniformity Amendment Act did not sanction it; but it was a sufficient answer that it was an address, not a prayer or a part of divine worship. In this address the clergy were very properly directed to announce the terms of the oath taken by the King at his Coronation, and one of the terms of the oath was of necessity stated as being that the King would to the utmost of his power maintain the Protestant Reformed Religion established by Law. To have omitted that would have been to omit a vital clause of the oath; to have altered it would have been to instruct the clergy to make an inadequate statement of the terms of the oath. A circular of protest was sent round to the parochial clergy, asking for their signatures to a declaration of inability to use the

Form of Service; they were requested to support by their signature an argument for a *suppressio veri* which had an air of less than scrupulousness,—“To inform the people that the King has taken an oath in the above terms will probably create an erroneous impression that the religion of the Church of England is in some way opposed to Primitive and Catholic antiquity.” If the Archbishop and those who worked with him had thought of this objection, as they might perhaps have been expected to do, the simple remedy would have been to state some of the solemn words used at the girding and oblation of the Sword, “Receive this Kingly Sword, brought now from the Altar of God,” “With this Sword . . . protect the Holy Church of God,” and at the investiture with the Ring, “Receive this Ring, the ensign of Kingly Dignity and of Defence of the Catholic Faith.” The addition of these words, in the form as sanctioned for use in some of the dioceses, changed the situation. That a one-sided impression, on a point of deep moment to large numbers of loyal members of the Church of England, was conveyed by the form as issued, cannot be denied.

There was naturally, as the time of the Coronation drew near, some anxiety as to the ability of the Archbishop to bear the physical strain of the long and complex function, every splendid detail of which tended to render the strain greater to a man of deep emotion, filled with a passionate sense of loyalty to the Queen who had passed away and to the King who had come in her stead. The great age and feebleness of the Dean of Westminster (Dr. Bradley), whose function at a Coronation is an arduous one, added appreciably to the general anxiety. When to all this there was added the shock of the sudden postponement of the ceremony, and the long-drawn doubt as to the date at which, if ever, the Coronation might take place, both of

these causes naturally increasing the strain upon the two aged dignitaries, there were many rumours of the appointment of a deputy by the Archbishop. No one who knew him well imagined that so long as there was life in him he would flinch from facing any personal risk in the fulfilment of the duties of his high office.

When the appointed day at last came, the Archbishop and the Dean were in their places, and the first words that rang out from the Archbishop gave evidence that his natural force was not abated. As the long ceremony rolled on, bringing cumulative strain upon the Archbishop's powers, there were indications that he was feeling the strain; but whether such indications were caused by loss of physical strength or by access of spiritual emotion it was impossible to say. Owing to the condition of the muscles of the Archbishop's eyes, each separate question, address, or injunction, which it was his duty to address to the King, had been printed in large type on scrolls backed with crimson silk, and these were unrolled one by one and held by the Bishop of Winchester (Dr. Davidson) on his right side, so as not to interpose between the Archbishop and the King. More than once there was a slight failure to catch the words quite accurately, and the wonder was that under the very difficult conditions the failure was so slight. Still the gallant old man went on, with form erect, voice strong and clear, and spirit evidently very high strung. The Coronation was completed, the enthronisation with its stirring address to the Sovereign by the Archbishop followed duly, and there remained only the homage, which according to the arrangements for the curtailment of the whole ceremony was to be tendered by the Archbishop both for himself as the first subject of the realm after the blood royal and also for the other prelates. At this most emotional point the

age and the deep feeling of the Archbishop mastered for a few moments his iron will, and he sank on his knee unable to rise again. The King, in his own serious weakness, affectionately helped the Primate to rise, and so this most touching episode ended, so far as most of the onlookers were aware. But when the Archbishop recovered his erect attitude, he laid his hand upon the crown on the King's head, and in a voice of deep emotion said, "God bless you, sir ; God bless you ; God be with you." The King caught his hand and kissed it.

There was yet another touching scene to be enacted. According to the form issued at Coronations, at the conclusion of the service the King and Queen and the Archbishop passed through the screen into St. Edward's Chapel, and the ceremony of laying the regalia on the altar there was duly completed. The news spread rapidly that the King sent to the Archbishop from his robing room a basin of the soup which by medical orders had been placed there for the King to take, before entering upon the long effort, so serious for one who had recently gone through so grave an illness, of walking in his heavy robes and crown, bearing the Sceptre and the Orb, the whole length of the Abbey Church of Westminster. That kindly act was a fitting close to a noble ceremony.

On the Monday following the Coronation, August 11, the King summoned the Archbishop to an audience at Buckingham Palace, in the course of which he gave him the Collar of the Victorian Order and desired him to wear it on all suitable occasions.

CHAPTER X

THE END

Last engagements—Last speech in the House of Lords—
Communication to the House of Lords by the Bishop of
Winchester—The end—The funeral—The grave—Appendix.

THE Archbishop was now very near his eighty-first birthday (November 30). A list of engagements for the last months of his life, other than interviews and ordinary routine, may give some idea of the vitality and force of will which endured to the end:—

Wednesday, Oct. 1.—To Wales.

Oct. 2.—Drove seven miles to Lampeter; service and sermon in the chapel; public luncheon and speeches; drove back at night.

Oct. 3.—Returned to Lambeth.

Saturday, Oct. 11.—To Canterbury.

Oct. 13.—Delivered part of Visitation Charge in the Cathedral Church.

Oct. 14.—Delivered a second part of his Charge. Speech at luncheon.

Oct. 15.—Off early to Ashford. Visitation Charge; speech at luncheon. Back to Canterbury.

Oct. 16.—Off early to Maidstone. Visitation Charge; speech at luncheon. Then to Lambeth.

Oct. 17.—Croydon. Visitation Charge; speech at luncheon. Back to Lambeth.

Oct. 18.—Delegation for electing a Bishop of Colombo. Returned to Canterbury.

Monday, Oct. 20.—To London. Then to Salisbury to

address the annual meeting of the Church of England Temperance Society.¹ Back to London and Canterbury. When the Archbishop came out from the meeting, to catch his train, it was raining. "Shall I fetch a cab?" some one asked. "Cab! No! I'm not made with sugar!"

Oct. 21.—To London. . Preached at Stepney in the evening.

Oct. 22.—Meeting of the Governing Body of Rugby School.

Oct. 24.—Presentation of the Bible Society's Bible to the King. Returned to Canterbury.

Oct. 25.—To Lambeth with Mrs. Temple, whose illness at Canterbury had been the cause of his return there on every possible occasion.

Oct. 26.—Thanksgiving at St. Paul's for the King's recovery. On this occasion the Archbishop wore his Convocation robes; all other bishops wore copes.

Oct. 28.—Bishops' meeting at Lambeth.

Oct. 30.—Sermon at St. Paul's, the last he preached there, to a Federation of Working Men's Clubs.

Nov. 1.—Consecration of the Bishop of Melbourne at St. Paul's.

Nov. 10.—The Mayor's Banquet at Canterbury.

Nov. 12.—Canterbury Temperance Council.

Nov. 16.—Sermon at St. Edmund's School, Canterbury.

Nov. 19.—Confirmation at Faversham.

Nov. 20.—To London. Ecclesiastical Commission. Institutions. Meeting at Church House for St. Augustine's, Canterbury. Back to Canterbury.

Sunday, Nov. 23.—Evening sermon in the Cathedral Church.

Sunday, Nov. 30.—Eighty-first birthday. Holy Communion in the Palace Chapel, 8 A.M. Sermon in the Cathedral Church at the Morning Service.

Tuesday, Dec. 2.—Meeting for Church Instruction and Church Defence.

Wednesday, Dec. 3.—To London.

Thursday, Dec. 4.—Ecclesiastical Commission, 11 to 12.30; interview with Dr. Neligan, Bishop elect, 1.30; another interview, 2.45; meeting of the Governors of St. Augustine's College, at the House of Lords, 3.30; House of Lords, Education Debate, 4 to 7.15.

¹ His speech on this occasion is published in *Five of the Latest Utterances of Frederick Temple*. Macmillan, 1903.

To that last item on Thursday, December 4, "Education Debate, 4 to 7.15," with its pathetic interest and its tragic end, we must now turn.

The long and serious labours of Dr. Temple in the cause of education are dealt with in other parts of these "Memories" of his life. When he became Archbishop, the time was nearly ripe for legislation which might hope to be in a sense final, but things had come to such a point that some temporary measure of financial relief for the voluntary schools was very urgently needed. The competition of elementary schools maintained wholly and in some cases lavishly from the rates had strung up the cost of elementary schools to a standard which pressed very hardly on schools maintained by voluntary subscriptions. The relatively high salaries given by many School Boards, the educational luxuries provided, and the non-elementary subjects added to the curriculum, were beyond the means of the Churchmen who had built and were still maintaining the schools in which more than half of the children of the poor were receiving adequate elementary education. As a temporary measure of relief, an Aid Grant was given by Act of Parliament to such schools for a period of five years, from 1897 to 1902.

The five years of the Aid Grant afforded a breathing time, during which the country could consider the momentous question, what the final settlement when it came should be. The Archbishop startled those who were face to face with the practical difficulty of making ends meet, in the management of voluntary schools, by announcing as his permanent solution of the difficulty that Church people must put their hands deeper into their pockets. To very many that was a counsel of despair. Public opinion among Churchmen appeared to demand that some considerable permanent

assistance should be given from public money to voluntary schools. The question was for a long time argued, rather hotly, whether such help should come from the local rates or from the public taxes, or partly from the one source and partly from the other. There was clearly no possibility of deciding that point by argument outside the Government; the Government would have to decide it. Towards the end of the five years of breathing space two large questions rose into a prominent place, the one, whether the friends of the voluntary schools should offer in return for public assistance a measure of public control in the management of aided voluntary schools; the other, what part or department of the cost of voluntary schools the State should be asked to pay, and what the Church people should undertake. It was eventually agreed by the Convocations that they should inform the Government of their readiness to admit one-third of each body of managers by election of the local educational authority in return for public help. The other question resolved itself into two alternatives: should the Church people offer to pay all the cost of the distinctive religious teaching of the schools, calculated on the proportion of the number of hours in each week occupied in definite religious teaching as contrasted with simple Bible reading, or should it offer to pay all ordinary landlord's expenses on the maintenance of the fabric of the schools? The Archbishop made no secret of his desire to offer that the cost of definite religious instruction should be paid by the religious community whose definite views were taught in the voluntary school. If that view had prevailed, there might have been serious questions in the long-run about the actual ownership of the fabric of the schools, but at least there could not have been passive resisters. The decision really

turned upon the complications which must arise if the landlord's repairs of the fabric were paid out of public money, and additional accommodation were provided from that source. The possibility was overlooked that there might be Nonconformists who would rather have their goods sold than pay an education rate reduced by the whole rent of the voluntary schools, a reduction probably greater than the cost of denominational teaching in the schools. Church people had for thirty years been paying heavy School Board rates for teaching which large numbers of them thoroughly disapproved, besides the cost of their own schools. Their consciences were tender towards obedience to the law of the land, and they naturally supposed that their Nonconformist fellow-citizens had tender consciences in the same direction. At a meeting of committees of the whole of all the Houses of Convocation, it was decided by a large majority not to offer to pay for the denominational teaching, but to adopt the other alternative. This was gravely unsatisfactory to those who knew how unable many schools would be to bear the cost of the fabrics, when it rested with an outside and conceivably unsympathetic body to order such repairs and improvements as they might consider or claim to be necessary.

The results arrived at were communicated by the Archbishop to the Government as the formal opinion of the Church. It is ordinarily said by opponents that the Bill as introduced was the Bishops' Bill. It is sufficient to say here, on absolute authority, that neither of the Archbishops, nor any of the Bishops, knew anything of what the provisions of the Bill were, until the Bill itself was made public property.¹ As the Act now stands, and as the Act is now being worked and inter-

¹ See Editor's Supplement, p. 660, footnote 3.—Ed.

preted by the central and local authorities, it gravely hampers the freedom of religious teaching to the children in the voluntary schools, and it imposes a financial burden which no small number of schools are finding too heavy to be borne. At the same time it is but justice to recognise that in many cases the Education Authorities are taking a broad-minded view of their duties in regard to voluntary schools.

It was a remarkable coincidence that the cause of education, which had been so long a part of the life of the Archbishop, should also be his death. On December 4, 1902, the Education Bill came up for second reading in the House of Lords. Earl Spencer, as the Leader of the Opposition, spoke against the Bill, and the Archbishop followed. He remarked that the main purposes of the Bill did not appear to be questioned at all in that House, and with very good reason; for its main purposes were, first, the establishment of a uniform system, which should handle all the different branches of education on one thoroughly consistent plan; secondly, the remedying of a long-standing defect by the organisation of secondary education; and, thirdly, the redressing of an injustice of which the Church had for some time had cause to complain, namely, that the burden put upon the supporters of Church schools was not fair. They had to pay subscriptions to the cost of their own schools and also rates for the support of the Board Schools. He thought it very difficult to maintain that that was just.

The rates paid for the schools constitute a demand upon all alike, and whether the man approves of the school or not he has to pay. Nevertheless, he may be asked for a very considerable sum over and above the rates to support those schools which he thinks not only the right sort of schools, but absolutely indispensable.

The position of the voluntary schools stands, he continued, on this ground : "The country will not have education without religious instruction." The Colonial Secretary (Mr. Chamberlain) had explained that he had tried it at Birmingham, where, if anywhere in England, it might have been thought it would have succeeded ; but he found that the country would not support him, and his own adherents would not support him ; he could not hold office in a Government which did not propose to adopt, on this fundamental question, the principle that the country would not have education without religious instruction.

The aim of the Bill was a great and noble aim ; it aimed at making a consistent system of our education. Further, it aimed at organising secondary education :—

Again and again in this House have I joined with others in pressing on the Government that our secondary education ought to receive attention, and that we were doing damage by leaving it without organisation. The necessity of organisation has at last been proved by unmistakable proofs—namely, that the authorities charged with the lower education have been driven by the position in which they found themselves to encroach upon the secondary education which stood next above them.

Earl Spencer had complained that the provision made for secondary education was quite inadequate. The Archbishop declared that if he had had the drawing up of the Bill he would have gone considerably further in the direction of dealing with secondary education than the Bill did :—

The noble Earl has said that we should do much better if we moved a little faster. As I have been saying so for the last thirty years in this House, I think that I can hardly object to what the noble Earl has said.

The third purpose of the Bill was to redress the injustice of compelling the supporters of voluntary

schools "to perform the double labour of supporting their own schools, which were a necessity, and of supporting the kind of schools which they did not themselves want." Many of the clergy, in a very impoverished condition, had been making severe self-sacrifices to provide what they found to be a necessary instrument for the discharge of their duty to the children of their flocks. These sacrifices, made for very many years, had received very inadequate consideration from either side interested in the Bill. It was a satisfaction to them to know that the instruction of the children would now be put on the stable ground of authorised national payment; but the condition that they must maintain the buildings, and repair them, and carry out any orders they might receive for improving them, did not seem a very adequate way of redressing a serious injustice. In this respect the Church was right in raising the complaint that though the Bill was doing something it was not doing nearly what it ought. But he admitted, nay, he fully believed, that the aim of the Bill, though in his judgment not adequately pursued, was honestly pursued.

At this point the Archbishop sank back into his seat; but immediately he was up again and spoke one more sentence: "The Bill is an honest and statesmanlike measure, and I hope your Lordships, in spite of any objections that may be made, will, nevertheless, pass it into law, and let us see how it will act when it begins to work."

He was then taken home to Lambeth in a very feeble state. With fluctuations of physical strength and much clearness of mental faculty he lived for three weeks.

On the 5th of December the Bishop of Winchester (Dr. Davidson) made the following communication to the House of Lords:—

I had the privilege this morning of speaking to the Archbishop upon the subject of this Bill and of his speech last night, and he desired me to say this—that had not physical weakness prevented, he desired to have concluded his speech by a very earnest appeal to all those whom his words might reach—the managers, clerical and lay alike, and all those who are interested in the voluntary schools which are still connected with the Church—that it should be one of their primary and foremost efforts when the Bill becomes law to see that no hardship is inflicted thereby upon Nonconformists. We have all along desired—those who take a lead in Church matters—that facilities of every kind should be given for the removal of every possible Nonconformist grievance that is removable in our parishes. But the most reverend Primate desired that the last words of his speech should be such an appeal “on behalf of those who, while not belonging to our Church, are as much entitled to their religious convictions as any of ourselves, any of your Lordships, any of those who are sending their children to a Church school being themselves Churchmen; and I beg that every possible endeavour might be made by us, who are responsible in those schools, for removing difficulties whenever that can possibly be done.”

It has been said of the first Earl of Chatham that he “died on the floor of the House.” It is very much more true of Dr. Temple. On April 7, 1778, Chatham was led into the House wrapped up in flannel and supported on crutches, to oppose the Duke of Richmond’s proposal that the independence of America should be immediately recognised and the British forces withdrawn. In a few broken words he protested against “the dismemberment of this ancient monarchy.” Rising a second time to reply to the Duke, he fell back in a fit. He was carried out and taken to a house in Downing Street, where he remained a few days. Thence, having to some degree recovered, he was removed to Hayes. There he died on May 11, 1778, thirty-six days after his seizure, being not quite sixty-nine and a half years of age. Dr.

Temple sank back into his seat in the House on December 4, 1902, and died nineteen days later, at the age of eighty-one years and twenty-three days.

On the morning of Thursday, December 11, the Archbishop expressed his desire to receive the Holy Communion, and his wish that the rite should be administered by the Archbishop of York. The Bishop of London (Dr. Winnington Ingram) and the Bishop of Winchester (Dr. Davidson) were also present; and the Rev. W. J. Conybeare, domestic chaplain, assisted. Many of the Lambeth household took part in the service, and Mrs. Temple and their two sons were by the Archbishop's side. After the administration, the Archbishop raised himself in his chair, and expressed his thanks to those who had joined with him "at the Lord's great Feast," and his especial gratitude to his household for their service and their kindness in the past. Then he turned to the Archbishop of York and gave him his blessing, and next blessed the Bishop of London. He then motioned to the Bishop of Winchester to come to him for the same purpose. But it was clear that the effort was becoming too great, and, as his last strength was due to his wife and sons, the rest then left the room that he might take leave of his family alone.

The end came somewhat suddenly. On Monday, December 22, the Archbishop seemed much better than for some days past, and his appearance fully bore out the favourable report given by the doctors in the morning bulletin. He seemed, if anything, to be gaining strength, and during the night took more nourishment. Shortly after 7.30 on the morning of the 23rd the nurses noticed a change, and at eight o'clock the family and the chaplain were in the room. The Archbishop appeared to be unconscious. A few

prayers were said, the blessing was pronounced, and the end came peacefully at a quarter past eight o'clock.

THE FUNERAL¹

The funeral was arranged to take place in the Cloister Garth of Canterbury Cathedral on Saturday, December 27, St. John's Day. The Archbishop had expressed no wishes with regard to the way in which the arrangements should be carried out in his own case ; but in speaking of "Christian Burial" he often said, both in public and in private, how strongly he hoped the day would come when greater simplicity would be the rule for all such services, with more stress laid upon the thoughts of "the Resurrection of the dead, and the Life of the world to come," than on the mournful partings of this life. He also greatly preferred that interments should be in the open ground instead of in, or below, buildings.

The body was removed from Lambeth Palace to Canterbury on Friday the 26th, and the arrangements throughout were characterised by great simplicity. A service was held in Lambeth Palace Chapel during the actual moment of removal. Nearly all his former chaplains, some friends, and most of the men of his household followed on foot ; the family, and the Mayor of Lambeth, in their own carriages. . At Victoria Station the Choir from St. John's, Wilton Road, the church hard by, was drawn up, and sang hymns ("For all Thy Saints who from their labours rest," "The Sower went forth sowing," and "O God, our help in ages past") during the time between the arrival of the procession and the

¹ This account of the funeral is written by Archdeacon Spooner.—ED.

departure of the train from the station. On the arrival at Canterbury, the Mayor, members of the Corporation, and the clergy of the city were in attendance; the latter, wearing their surplices, and bareheaded, lined the way from the funeral coach to the hearse. A large number of citizens assembled at the station, and at the Cathedral, and along the line of route. At the Cathedral the body was met at the great west door by the Dean, the Vice-Dean (Bishop of Dover), and the other Cathedral clergy. As the procession moved slowly up the nave the opening sentences of the Burial Service were chanted, the Archiepiscopal Cross being carried by the Archbishop's chaplain, the Rev. W. J. Conybeare, who immediately preceded the coffin. Very striking was the scene in the dusk of the short December day, the stately Cathedral with its time-worn stones receiving back the earthly remains of the great Archbishop who had laboured so unsparingly in the cause of Christ, to whom the ancient Church is dedicated.

The coffin was left at the foot of the choir steps; and the body was watched through the night by relays of the clergy, the arrangements being made by Dr. Mason, one of the Canons Residentiary, and the Sub-Warden of St. Augustine's College. By the wish of the Archbishop's family all the usual mourning hangings in the Cathedral were dispensed with; the White Festival Frontal was on the Altar, and the Throne was decorated with palms, ferns, and white flowers. The brightness of the sunshine on the day of the funeral was a fit accompaniment to the character of the service, which breathed a spirit of hope and thankfulness for the good gift of God in the long life of His servant. The words of Wesley's familiar anthem, "Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ," which was chosen for the

service, in the passage "See that ye love one another with a pure heart fervently," seemed like a message from the dead. And the recessional hymns that were sung on the way to the Cloister Garth, "The saints of God! their conflict past, And life's long battle won at last," and "The strife is o'er, the battle done, Now is the Victor's triumph won," were felt to be in accordance with what he himself believed and had taught. His old friend, and neighbour of recent years, Dean Farrar, who was himself in failing health, made a great effort to be present, and took a small part in the service. The Benediction was pronounced by the Archbishop of York, after which the "Nunc Dimittis" was sung. As the large congregation which had gathered to show their respect dispersed from the green and sunny Cloisters, the concluding words of the poem by the Archbishop of Armagh, which had appeared in the *Times* a few days before, represented what was in every one's thoughts:—

So let him sleep, where his last life-work found him,
Arms folded on his breast,
And let the angels draw the curtains round him,
And sing him to his rest.

The grave is now marked by a large slab of granite from his native Cornwall, the "Canterbury Cross" being carved in low relief upon it, with simply his name and dates of birth and death; and within a few feet lies Dean Farrar, who was taken to his rest so shortly after him.

The Cloister Garth is the most peaceful of "quiet resting-places";—the grave itself is close to the garden wall of the beautiful home which he made and loved to live in, and under the shadow of the glorious tower of the "Angel Steeple."¹

¹ For commentary on Dr. Temple's later years, see Editor's Supplement, chapters iv. and v. — "Responsibility" and "The Completed Life."—ED.

· APPENDIX

BY THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY (DR. JOHN WORDSWORTH)

Archbishop Temple and the Responsio Archiepiscoporum Angliæ ad litteras apostolicas Leonis Papæ XIII., dated Friday, February 19, 1897.

ON September 13, 1896, Pope Leo XIII. issued a Bull, called from its first words "*Apostolicæ Curæ*," in which he gave his reasons for denying the validity of Anglican Ordinations. The cause of his issuing this Bull is somewhat obscure, and this is perhaps not the place to attempt to state what is known, or may be reasonably conjectured, about it. He must, of course, have thought it opportune to crush decisively any hopes that existed on the part of a certain number both of Anglican and Continental Churchmen as to a possibility of some scheme for an immediate better understanding, and future final re-union between the Churches, which would not involve the re-ordination of Anglican clergy. That such hopes were entertained is shown perhaps most clearly by the publication of the *Revue Anglo-Romaine* at Paris, which extended to fifty-one weekly numbers, beginning December 7, 1895, and continuing until November 21, 1896, which will be an interesting record of these efforts, and will enlighten and encourage future workers in the same cause.

Had Leo XIII. decided otherwise a very troublesome and painful dispute would have been amicably settled, and a certain amount of co-operation between Anglicans and Romans might have been at once possible instead of the thinly veiled hostility which now characterises our official relations.

It is possible, indeed, that the Roman Church might have thereby at once secured the submission of a certain number of our clergy, a result which all our Bishops would

naturally, and on many grounds, have viewed with deep regret. The term "submission" alone involves the acknowledgment of the existence of a monarchy or supremacy which is alien from the spirit of our religion and unknown to primitive Christianity, and which has been established, where it exists, very largely by crooked means and arrogant pretensions. Nor was it possible to think hopefully of full communion with Rome until it and the Churches connected with it had advanced a great deal further in the path of reform than they have hitherto done. There are other very serious questions between us besides that of papal supremacy.

I was well aware of all this, but nevertheless I had long felt it my duty to do what was possible to remove this particular element of bitterness from the Roman controversy. It seemed to stand by itself and to be capable of almost independent treatment; and it was clear to me that our efforts to influence Roman Catholics in other directions would be very much facilitated by success in this.

The subject of the validity of Anglican Ordinations had been brought again to the front during the period which succeeded the Vatican Council of 1870, owing to the intercourse with foreign Churchmen which was opened to Englishmen by the old Catholic movement in Germany and Switzerland and in a less degree elsewhere. It was satisfactory to know that the leading theologians and prelates of the Old Catholics, particularly the late Dr. Döllinger and Bishop Reinkens, and Bishop Herzog, who is happily still with us, were satisfied with our position in this matter, and cordially welcomed our co-operation. But it was known also that the cautious community which centres at Utrecht continued its old hesitation, born of its acceptance of old Roman tradition on the question, although some of its ablest men were convinced by the example and the arguments of their Swiss and German colleagues.

It was my task, for various reasons, to do my best to dissipate the prejudices of our Dutch friends, with whose principal men I was personally acquainted. In November 1889 I was asked by the Secretary of the General Assembly of the Church of Holland (Pastor T. Van Santen), writing in the name of the Archbishop of Utrecht, to examine a report on the subject which had been presented to the Assembly by a Committee of three clergy. This I did, with the kind help particularly of Bishop Stubbs, in a letter to Archbishop John Heykamp entitled *De Successione Episcoporum in*

Ecclesie Anglicana written in Latin, with an English version on its opposite pages, and dated May 13, 1890.¹ In this reply I touched lightly on the sufficiency of the Anglican rite, inasmuch as the report in question seemed to show that it was not really in dispute between us, and entered more at length into the questions which had been raised with regard to the consecrations of William Barlow and Matthew Parker. That letter, I believe, was successful in convincing our Dutch friends on these points then at issue. It was, however, a surprise and a disappointment when some four years later, and under a new Archbishop of Utrecht, the same three pastors, with the addition of a fourth, issued another report in 1894, in which they took up the old objections against the intention of the Anglican Church in the sixteenth century, the opinions on priesthood and sacrifice held by Cranmer and Barlow, the defects of the Edwardian Liturgy, etc., and particularly the insufficiency of the Edwardian rite of ordination. My reply, written with the approval and encouragement of Archbishop Benson, took the form of a letter addressed to Archbishop Gerard Gul entitled *De Validitate Ordinum Anglicanorum Responsio ad Batavos*, dated October 18, 1894, of which a second edition was printed in 1895. A little later in the year I published *Trois Lettres sur la position de l'Église Anglicane* on similar subjects, addressed to two friendly clergy of the Church of France, one of them being the Abbé Portal, who, under the name of Fernand Dalbus, had done much to revive interest on the subject in that country, and who afterwards edited the *Revue Anglo-Romaine*. I also contributed a preface to the book of Messrs. Denny and Lacey entitled *de Hierarchia Anglicana*.

I mention these writings in order to explain why it was that I was called to take the part which I afterwards did with regard to the Papal Bull of 1896. The book *de Hierarchia* was a translation into Latin, by Mr. Lacey, of an earlier one by Mr. Denny published by the S.P.C.K., which I knew and was glad to commend. I therefore willingly wrote a preface to it without paying much attention to the altera-

¹ It was published by Gilbert and Rivington for the Anglo-Continental Society, and republished in English only by the S.P.C.K. at the instance of the late Bishop Hayes of Trinidad, in 1892. The three clergy were G. C. van Schaik, G. van der Poll, and N. Prins. The fourth (added to the Committee in 1893-94) was E. Wijker of Amsterdam.

tions and enlargements introduced into the new edition, especially as I was at that moment starting on a voyage round the world and was only able to correct the proof of my preface imperfectly. But I afterwards found that there were expressions in the final form of this book which I should not have used myself, though I was of course in full agreement with its general argument. I venture to make this explanation here as the *de Hierarchia* was, I believe, largely used in the personal attempt which was made, quite apart from myself and from all Episcopal authorities, in the early part of 1896, to bring our position to the knowledge of a commission which was sitting at the time in Rome, and through that commission to the Pope. Some day the history of that attempt may be written, but this is not the place to write it, and I am in fact only imperfectly in possession of the facts about it.

The suggestion of an official reply to the Papal Bull did not, however, come from myself, but from Bishop Creighton, then of Peterborough, who approached Archbishop Benson on the subject shortly after the publication of that document. He proposed that three of us—himself, Bishop Stubbs of Oxford, and myself—should co-operate with the Archbishop in composing such a reply. I received a letter from Bishop Creighton at Glasgow, where I was then paying a visit, asking for my co-operation in the plan. I at once began (on September 29, 1896) to draft a letter on my journey southward by way of Lincoln and Peterborough. At the latter place I was naturally the guest of Bishop Creighton, and I read to him my draft as far as it was framed, and took his advice as to topics. If he had not been shortly afterwards called to the See of London he would doubtless have taken a much more active part in drafting the *Responsio* than he was actually able to do. I finished my draft on Friday, October 9, at Tyneham, Dorset, where my brother then was, and posted it to Archbishop Benson at Hawarden. It just reached him on the Saturday, but was never opened by him. He died, it will be remembered, on the Sunday morning of October 11, in Hawarden Church. It will also be remembered that his last public act was to write a short memorandum commenting on the Papal Bull and informing the public that it would be answered. I believe that this was almost the last paper he signed before his death.¹

¹ It is published in his *Life*, vol. ii. p. 623.

Two of my letters to Archbishop Benson at this time lie before me now. In the first, dated "West Lulworth, Wareham, October 7, 1896," I wrote:—

"Of course you will kindly look upon what I have written as *material*.

"I have done the best I could under the circumstances, and I feel strongly that it is best to write *directly* to Pope Leo.

"(1) It is most in accordance with primitive precedent.

"(2) It is the boldest and therefore in dangerous days the safest course.

"(3) It enables one to show, without affectation, what our belief is as to our position in regard to him.

"(4) It will ensure our letter being printed and read in every country of the world.

"I have tried to write *in spiritu lenitatis*, but it is hard. We must do so, however."

The second letter was from Tyneham, October 9, 1896, merely covering the enclosure and ending: "If my tentamen is any good it might perhaps be *softened* here and there."

On receiving back the draft, which I did with a very sad and sore heart, on the Tuesday after the Archbishop's death, I sent it on to the Archbishop of York, who is, with myself, the only survivor of the responsible fellow-workers in this business. Bishop Temple, as he then was of London, was nominated to the Archbishopric on or about October 24, and the Archbishop of York at once expressed his wish to get his opinion on the subject. I have also before me a longish letter which I wrote to him myself on the 28th. Bishop Temple was, however, too much occupied with his duties and farewells in London to give much time or thought to the *Responsio* before the confirmation of his election at Bow Church on December 22. In the meantime it was thought best that the draft should be further considered by the Bishops above named under the presidency of the Archbishop of York. We met at the Athenæum, if I recollect rightly, on November 4, and agreed to print my draft, which I had for my own convenience put into type, that it might be fully considered. On November 7, the Bishop (Temple) of London, after some examination of the draft, also agreed that it should be printed. It was then circulated in whole or in part in slips, which of course made it easier to obtain the opinions of others besides the Archbishop of York and the two learned historians who were then happily working in full vigour with us. I do not doubt, as I look back now, and review the

pile of valuable letters before me from the men best qualified to give advice on the points on which they were consulted, that the delay in publication enabled the *Responsio* to be much more powerful and accurate than it would otherwise have been. After its publication I received a letter from President Van Thiel, Head of the Dutch Old Catholic Seminary of Amersfoort, dated March 22, 1897, in which this sentence occurs: "Pour la Réponse, ses arguments me semblent très convaincants; à mon avis c'est une réponse sans réplique." If this were so, it was very largely due to the generous help offered by the learned men to whom I refer.

Without going into needless details I may mention that the first points which caused much debate were whether the letter should be addressed to the Pope in person and what should be the tone of it. It was on this latter point that Archbishop Temple, when he took up the matter in earnest on January 4, 1897, was most decided and emphatic. I had four hours' hard work with him on that day at the Church House—and what a delightful fellow-worker he was! At first we kept the address to the Pope, but the Archbishop was determined from the first that every trace of bitterness should be eradicated from the draft, and this was done with great care and thoroughness. I have no hesitation in saying that this determination was due not to policy, but to deep Christian feeling as to what our Lord would wish to be the temper of controversy. The letter gained much thereby both in dignity and impressiveness.

I find amongst my letters one from a distinguished French scholar and ecclesiastic, dated March 17, 1897, which just expresses this characteristic:—

"Je vous remercie de m'avoir fait lire la lettre des deux Archevêques. J'en ai beaucoup apprécié le ton grave et calme. Il était impossible de prendre une attitude plus digne dans une circonstance des plus difficiles.

"Je souhaite que la lecture de cette pièce produise ici l'impression qu'elle m'a faite à moi-même. Mais peut-on l'espérer après le revirement dont nous avons été les témoins stupéfaits?"

This "ton grave et calme" was not indeed due to one Archbishop only, but it was a very marked feature of Archbishop Temple's attitude in this difficult position. The reader will also remark the allusion made to the "revirement" or sudden change of policy which is here attributed to the Pope.

At a later stage the form of address itself was changed, and the words "Universis Ecclesiae Catholicae Episcopis inscripta"—"Addressed to the whole body of Bishops of the Catholic Church"—were added to the title. The case of John Gordon was also, with advantage to the literary presentation of the matter, removed to an appendix and only summarised in chapter vii. There is, however, some reason to think that the decision of the Holy Office in Gordon's case was the real crux in the minds of the Roman authorities, and that the fact that it was published on a Thursday (*feria quinta*) invests it in the eyes of a certain school of Roman theologians with an element of infallibility because the Pope presides in person on that day. It was, in any case, generally understood in Rome that, when the Pope referred the question to the Holy Office, it would deal with it on the ground of its previous decision and not really consider any "new light." In fact it was thought that the Pope had tied his own hands by such reference and that all the appearance of argument in his letter was superfluous. The two other chapters which gave us most trouble were the eleventh, in which the Eucharistic doctrine of the Roman "Canon missae" was examined, and compared with that of our Liturgy, and the nineteenth, in which the forms of the English Ordinal were compared with those of the Roman Pontifical. On both these chapters Archbishop Temple gave very sound and careful advice. Though he obviously had not time to make any fresh researches, it was clear that the subject was familiar to him from old reading, and his quick perception of what was a good and valid argument and what was an undue refinement was most helpful.

Two more meetings of what we may call the Committee followed on January 28 and 29, at the first of which the two Archbishops and the Bishops of London (Creighton), Oxford (Stubbs), and myself were present, and all but Oxford at the second. I do not remember that we had any further meetings, but of course many letters passed. On February 20 I received the two Archbishops' signatures to the *Responsio*, which was dated by them on the 19th as it appears in print. It was published, if I recollect rightly, on March 9, by Messrs. Longmans, Green & Co., who also published the different versions. The letter and the English version were printed in Salisbury.

The letter was written originally entirely in Latin. The English version was partly by myself, partly by the Rev. Hugh

Fraser Stewart, then Vice-Principal of the Theological College at Salisbury, and now Chaplain of Trinity College, Cambridge. The French translation was by Mr. Alexis Larpent, now Secretary of the Anglican and Foreign Church Society (which has taken the place of the Anglo-Continental Society and of the Association for the Furtherance of Christianity in Egypt). The Greek version was by Mr. Brightman with the very valuable co-operation of Dr. John Gennadius, formerly Greek Minister in London. In both of these Archbishop Temple took a keen interest.

Some alleged trifling faults in the Latin came later to my knowledge, and I put them before Archbishop Temple, but he made very light of them and hardly would permit any alteration to be made.

As regards the number of copies printed, I find that the publication began on March 9, 1897, and that 3675 copies of the Latin were printed between that day and July 8. On the whole 4100 were printed separately.

Of the English version 8000 were printed separately and 500 others were bound up with the Latin. The latter were sent to all Bishops of our communion.

Of the Greek version 500 were printed.

Of the French version 250. Of the Latin a good many were sent by the Archbishops and other friends to foreign ecclesiastics.

I ought perhaps to add that the Archbishops were good enough to give me the profits of the sale of the letter for the use of my Diocese or for any good purpose I might select. I used them for work connected with the Anglo-Continental Society and the Jerusalem and the East Mission Fund, which seemed to me to be proper recipients of such gifts, on an occasion like the one here described, which so closely concerned our intercourse with foreign churches.

The *Responsio* elicited a good deal of criticism, but the Archbishops only thought it worth while to reply to the *Vindication of the Bull Apostolicæ Curæ* addressed to them directly by Cardinal Vaughan and fifteen Roman Catholic Bishops of the province of Westminster, dated December 29, 1897. The Archbishops' reply (published in the *Times* of March 14, 1898, and in the *Guardian* of the 16th) was as follows:—

The Archbishops' reply to Cardinal Vaughan

LAMBETH PALACE, S.E.,
March 12, 1898.

MY LORD CARDINAL—We have carefully read the letter addressed to us by your Eminence and the Bishops associated with you under the title of *A Vindication of the Bull Apostolicæ Curæ*.

But we do not see how anything would be gained by again going over the ground covered by the Bull and our answer.

We need scarcely add that we are quite unable to admit the claims made in your opening paragraphs as regards the power and authority of his Holiness the Pope. Such claims have been deliberately and consistently rejected, not only by the Church of England, but also by the great Churches of the East. Nor can we allow that these bodies have given any evidence of that chaos which you suppose to be inevitable where the Papal claims are not accepted.

In one respect it seems to us that your letter hardly justifies the title which you give to it of *A Vindication of the Bull Apostolicæ Curæ*. For the Bull, though it deals with the matter, the form, and the intention of the Ordinal, makes no direct reference to the doctrine of transubstantiation, whereas in your letter the acceptance of that doctrine is practically constituted the one sure test of the validity of holy orders. Had his Holiness (in his Bull) followed the line of argument which you have now adopted, our answer must have taken a different form. But we could not answer what he did not say. The Church of England has clearly stated her position with respect to this doctrine, and it is unnecessary for us to say that we heartily and firmly concur in the judgment which she has pronounced.

It is, for us, simply impossible to believe it to be the will of our Lord that admission to the ministry of the Church of Christ should depend upon the acceptance of a metaphysical definition, expressed in terms of mediæval philosophy, of the mysterious gift bestowed in the Holy Eucharist; above all, when we remember that such a definition was unknown to the Church in the early ages of its history and only publicly affirmed by the Church of Rome in the thirteenth century.

While we earnestly beseech Almighty God to fulfil in His own time and way our Saviour's prayer for the unity

of His Church, we sorrowfully believe that among the hindrances to this fulfilment there are few more powerful than the claims of supremacy and infallibility alleged on behalf of the Pope of Rome, and the novel dogmas which have been accepted from time to time by the Roman Church. —We are your Eminence's servants in Christ,

F. CANTUAR.

WILLELM : EBOR :

His Eminence the Lord Cardinal Vaughan.

I was in the East during the months which followed the publication of Cardinal Vaughan's *Vindication*, and I was not consulted as to the form of the Archbishops' reply to it. I might have suggested that it would have been wise just to notice and refute an apparently telling criticism of the Cardinal's (§ 26), viz. that we had, in chapter xii., overlooked the force of an "or" in the Pope's very important and crucial definition of the requisites of a valid form of ordination to the priesthood. The Cardinal had, however, himself neglected to consult the Latin originals both of the Bull and the *Responsio*, and had tacitly identified and confused the terms "sacerdotium" and "presbyteratus." Our contention that there are valid ordination forms, in which neither the "sacerdotium" nor the "grace and power" of offering sacrifice are expressed, is obviously correct. The discovery, since that time, of the *Sacramentary of Sarapion* gives us another which contains no mention even of the "presbyterate." Our contention, therefore, in the *Responsio* was perfectly sound.

JOHN SARUM,
Whitsuntide, 1905.

THE EDITOR'S SUPPLEMENT-
FREDERICK TEMPLE



ARCHBISHOP TEMPLE, FROM THE CARTOON FOR THE MEMORIAL WINDOW
IN EXETER CATHEDRAL.

CHAPTER I

DEVELOPMENT

Character illustrated from correspondence—Schooldays—Introduction to Oxford—Dr. Jenkyns—Formation of friendships—Growth of view, political, philosophical, literary—Work for Ireland Scholarship and Degree—Final result—First impressions of the Oxford Movement—Ward—Newman—Pusey—Attraction and repulsion—Death of a College acquaintance—Growth of controversy—Temple's perplexity—Devotional study and practical religious duties—Tract XC.—Bishop Selwyn and Dr. Arnold at Oxford—Death of Dr. Arnold and offer by Dr. Tait of a Rugby Mastership—Balliol tutorship—Increasing influence upon Temple of the Oxford Movement—Mr. Jelf's letter to Mrs. Temple—Crisis of mental anxiety—Correspondence between son and mother—Ward's deprivation and final secession—Consequent reaction on Temple's mind—Growth of liberal view—Mental settlement and Ordination—Summary as to permanent influence of the Oxford Movement on Temple's mind.

THE subject of the final section of this Book of Memoirs is the man Frederick Temple—not the official career but the personality. No public man was ever more true to himself than the late Archbishop: he was never on pose—always perfectly natural. But the public life was not a full expression, and there is very much which may legitimately be told, and without the knowledge of which not a little of the full meaning of the life will be lost, that does not come out in the story of the public career. There is much also of the public career which needs the light shed upon it by the more

personal history to make it intelligible. This supplement is necessary. In each section of the life the man is left as far as possible to tell his own tale, but whereas hitherto he has spoken chiefly through his actions and public utterances, for the final section some reference must be made to his own letters.

The picture of the man in old age¹ shows a countenance weather-beaten and strongly marked, but the lines though cut deep are few; it is a simple face. One of the plainest marks of the character was a sense of duty and loyalty to it. The characteristic was developed early. The simplicity of the home-reared boy saves him from all touch of priggishness.

To his Mother

Jan. 30, 1834 (age 12).

The boys laugh at me very much because of my trowsers which they say are too big but I do not care much about them. . . . I now learn Ovid's *Metamorphoses* and Old Testament in Latin. I can assure (you) I find it rather hard but all the boys of my class come to me for an explanation of any difficulty that may chance to arise which of course I explain to them as well as I can but then after school if any of the other boys remark it they always call me fag and say that I am a very shabby fellow for fagging so hard, they tell me that if I do so in the higher school I will get a licking for it, but I don't believe them, for all the big boys praise me very much; Mr. Jones the person to whom I say my lessons is liked very much by the boys for he is very good-natured.

To his sister Netta

o TIVERTON, March 1, 1835.

. . . The boys fancy because I write in Italian that they may read my letters to Katy and ever since they have been saying whenever they see me My dearest Catherina.²

He begins Latin verses and writes them 'while the other boys are sitting round the fire—they

¹ See p. 401.

² "Earlier Years" Memoir, vol. i. p. 21.

come up teasing, putting out his candle, and observing how mean it is to fag.' But he goes on fagging nevertheless.

His interest in science is developed early :—

To his sister Netta

TIVERTON, Feb. 8, 1835.

. . . Yesterday we went to a lecture in the town where we were shown a drop of water magnified to the size of five feet in diameter, and we saw insects of the size of rats in it running about and eating each other. We were afterwards shown a picture about two inches square magnified and we looked at it through a bottle of water and upon mixing spirits of wine with the water it began to change and looked like something else and so it went on. The boys however did not like it particularly as they were obliged to pay a shilling each but I think it is well worth a shilling.

So too his diligence :—

To his Mother

TIVERTON, March 29, 1835.

. . . It is a great advantage to me being put into this class for the one above it is always thought to be the hardest in the school and that is the class we all try to get at for there is the place to learn, there is the place where you may fag without being laughed at; indeed I have very hard work to do in this class for I have to get up all the construing offhand from where my class mates begin which is about twenty pages of very hard Greek. It is nevertheless very pretty, being the Dialogues of the Dead, and there are a great many very pretty stories in it.

To his Mother

. . . I answered seventeen out of twenty-one questions that were given us to answer and I should have answered them all if I had had time. But it has had one good effect at least, which is that we have all learnt a good deal in the course of our studies. Nobody has answered more than eighteen and few have done that; but then there is a great difference in the manner of answering them and it often happens that one who has answered five or six is better than

one who has answered ten or fifteen. On the whole the boys have got up this work better this time than any other since I have been here, for the bottom fellows generally answer only two or three and this time they have none answered less than ten. I have been *accused* of beginning this practice, for when I began to fag, all the rest were obliged to, in order to keep their places; they all tell me, they would not have done it, if I had not begun.

Not content with reading himself he mingles grandfatherly advice with affection in his messages to his younger brother:—

. . . Give my love to Johnny and tell him to mind to learn his Latin grammar well as it is of the greatest consequence and I knew nothing more when I came to this school first.

His obedience to his mother is on a par with his diligence, and yet more remarkable in a young boy is his consideration for others:—

It is a holiday next Monday and we want to come home on the Saturday; but you told us never to come home without your leave, and as we do not know whether we shall have leave or no, we cannot come home unless you send for us. So that if you do we shall be ready and if you do not we must stay here.

. . . Yesterday I and Johnny walked about the town with the Lawsons; they wanted me to stay out very late, but I did not like to do so because I was afraid that I should be keeping the old people of the house up.

It goes without saying that a boy thus bent on “fagging” and determined on doing what he thought was right without regard to the ways and words of others—hot-tempered withal—should get to loggerheads with some of his schoolfellows. His first battle came very early in his career:—

TIVERTON, *Feb.* 26, 1834.

I received your letter yesterday in the midst of a battle with a boy called Elton, and though I was full as strong as he was, yet he, (being experienced in the art of fighting), was

able to hit me very hard blows on the face, while I could not touch him there at all ; and I believe he would have beat me, if one of the Monitors had not come up and separated us. The cause of the battle was this, he coming up gave me a blow, in fun, but being rather cross, I did not like it, and I told him so upon which he gave me another, and I returned it and so the battle began.

Along with his pugnacity went a certain amount of playful impudence.¹

In writing to his son William he alludes to the propensity :—

How often am I to tell you that your Father when he was a Boy did all the impudence that would be needed for at least three generations.

He was brimful of his love for his home :—

I have just returned from a walk to a hill which is not very far off and you may imagine the delight I had when I found I could see Blackdown and afterwards Axon. I really thought I could see somebody out in the fields walking about.

His walking powers were developed at Blundell's School. When he was driving over the Tiverton country with the Rural Dean on one of his Confirmation tours, he told him that he had often covered the nine miles from Blundell's to his mother's house (Axon) in one and a half hours.

Gradually childish things begin to be put away and religious instincts awake. His early Confirmation has already been mentioned.²

The following extracts give indications that his lifelong desire that religion should rise above party was already beginning to take shape ; they also show the beginning of his taste for the careful study of the Bible :—

We went yesterday to the meeting and several clergymen made some beautiful speeches. Mr. Blackmore spoke for an

¹ "Earlier Years" Memoir, vol. i. p. 33.

² *Ibid.* p. 30.

hour and a quarter and made a most beautiful speech; all our clergymen were there except . . . Mr. Sanders and Mr. Boulton were both there but they did not speak except to move a vote of thanks to the Mayor who was in the chair; it was pleasing to see men of both parties, both Whigs and Tories, lay aside all political animosity and join in the cause of religion.

March 20.

Our Greek Testament is set; it is Mark's Gospel and the history of the Jews till the division under Jeroboam. Will you please send me as well as the other books, Barnes on the New Testament if I may have it.

March 5, 1836.

. . . I recollect when I was at home Netta asked me what was meant by the baptism for the dead; I did not know then but I have since found out. There were a sect of Christians at that time in Corinth who, if a man died in the faith but unbaptized, used to lay a living person on the body and baptize him there as the representative of the dead man, hoping that God in His mercy would accept of this vicarious baptism, and the Apostle argues: Whence could these men have had such a decided conviction of the resurrection but from God.

His sense of responsibility deepens. The wish to save his mother expense is always coming up:—

My pocket is getting very low already, but I am keeping regular accounts so that you may see, when I come home, how I have spent it.

Before long, anxieties about his own future supervene. To secure his scholarship, he works harder than ever:—

November 13, 1836.

I have worked so hard at my Herodotus that I have completely finished it up to the place where I am now construing at the school. Before I come home at the vacation I intend to read through all the algebra books I have. I find algebra very hard but very interesting, and I like it the better as I go on.

The account of the final success in gaining the Blundell Scholarship is given in a letter from Temple to an elder schoolfellow, Edward Pearce, of

Somer Leigh, Dorset,¹ under whose charge young Temple had been put by Mr. Sanders when he first went to school :—

. . . The meeting this year was very full, and the room was almost close enough to make one faint, besides the anxiety which must always attend speaking before so many people. There were nineteen Trustees here. I can hardly describe to you the painfulness of the suspense in which I was kept from the time of the examination to that of the decision, especially as I knew that I had no interest at all with the Trustees, whilst one of my opponents had solicited the votes of each. When I was called in I got up to the table, and there I was obliged to hold by it to prevent myself from falling.

The above reference may be supplemented by a letter written five years later (September 1843) by Frederick Temple to his friend Robert Lawson. It gives a description of the scene at the annual dinner of the Old Blundellians, when the Scholarship had been crowned by the final success of a Double First :—

September 23, 1843.

. . . As to me, I found it a tremendous affair, much more than I ever thought it would be. . . . All my philosophy, and with it all my nerve, deserted me at the moment I most needed it; my voice trembled, my knees shook, and my head swam, and, in short, to this moment I hardly know what I said. . . . My health was proposed by Mr. Carew (John Carew), so to him, of course, my reply was especially addressed. Some time after the health of the Trustees was proposed, and Sir Thomas Acland replied. In his speech he took occasion to observe that it was extremely gratifying to the Trustees to find their system approved by the deliberate judgment of those who had the best opportunity of knowing its real and exact value: then he went on to talk of a certain youth "who had laid his hand on the pedestal of fame, but (I suppose ashamed of such audacity) denied most strenuously that he had touched it; for which he (Sir Thomas Acland) highly applauded him."

¹ "Earlier Years" Memoir, vol. i. p. 30. .

Temple's school letters, taken as a whole, are a simple record of the steady upbuilding of character on the foundation of a good home. That the estimate of future possibilities was high may be gathered from a forecast about him, to which reference is made in the following memorandum supplied by a son of one of the Tiverton Trustees of that day :—

When riding home with my father, John Were Clarke, after his attending a magistrate meeting at Cullompton, we passed Temple, his brother, and Blackmore, the author of *Lorna Doone*, playing marbles in the Turnpike Road. My father said to me, "Tom, you will live to see it, but I shall not, that Temple will be a Bishop"; and when Temple was appointed Bishop of Exeter, I called upon him and told him what my father said to me.¹

THOS. CLARKE.

February 1903.

The translation of the schoolboy from the country home and the provincial school was for Frederick Temple something much more than the ordinary entrance of a young man upon University life; it was like the passing into a new world. The influence of Oxford upon Temple has already been estimated in a previous section,² but it was so great a power in his life that there is still room for the commentary upon this period afforded by a further reference to his home letters. In the intimacy and simple directness of these he is himself telling what Oxford was to him—he is his own interpreter. He was absolutely in his mother's confidence, and preserves from first to last the natural and open tone of the boy—accounting for his expenses, telling out his heart, and deferring to her judgment, when he was a double first class-man and a Fellow of Balliol, with as much

¹ "Earlier Years" Memoir, vol. i. p. 37, where the story is told in a somewhat different form.

² *Ibid.* pp. 39-93.

humility, simplicity, and implicit obedience as when he carried her messages and would do nothing except at her word.

I. The general life of the University was a great revelation to him, but the inherent gentility and sobriety of his nature enabled him to take it, not indeed without a sense of strangeness, but with no loss of balance.

The following letters give his first impressions :—

To his Mother

Gentlemanliness of manners seems to be here carried almost to excess; I hardly like to see people whom I can easily perceive have very little good opinion of each other as cordial when they meet as if they were the most intimate friends. At the same time etiquette is most strictly enforced—that is, Oxford etiquette. I heard some of them talking to-day about some Freshman having committed, or proposed to commit, what they regarded as a most heinous crime; and I found out that he had said something about calling upon a man whom he had known intimately before, but who had come to Oxford before him. . . .

April 19, 1839.

. . . I do not intend ever to give wine parties, nor, indeed, do I drink any wine, for I do not like to get into the habit of drinking other people's wine when I cannot afford to have any of my own. I must invite my friends to breakfast with me sometimes, but that will be the least expensive kind of party.

He begins to feel his way into friendships :—

. . . I have made several acquaintances here, but though they are very gentlemanly in manner, I hardly like to approach them too closely till I know what sort of persons they are really. — I like very much; he is, I think, more serious than the generality, but I do not know him enough to say further. He is by no means poor, but yet far from extravagant, which is rather rare.

He thus sums up the conclusions of his term as a freshman :—

To his sister Netta

May 22, 1839.

. . . I do not dislike Oxford I confess ; but the union of gentlemanly manners with want of Christian principle is exceedingly dangerous. The men in Balliol that I know most about are the Scholars, and they are generally men of real principle ; but I am acquainted with some men here who are anything but that, and I confess that I wish I could get rid of their acquaintance.

The first term had enabled him to look around him and take his bearings. The succeeding days of his undergraduate career note a gradual growth of friendship and thought, as his mind and heart open out to all the new life around him.

To his Mother

October 19, 1839.

. . . We have a great number of Freshmen this term ; so many, indeed, that we have not room for them all, and many have been obliged to hire sitting-rooms in the town, and get friends in the College to lend them their sofas for the night, for they must be within College at night. The Master apologises to them for this poor accommodation with evident satisfaction, and tells them that "Balliol is so *overflowing* that it is quite impossible for him to procure them better."

His fondness for the Master and gratitude for many kindnesses went along with a perpetual sense of amusement at his many little foibles¹ :—

. . . Some morning this week the College statutes will be read in the Chapel ; the day is never known, and if it were the Chapel would be pretty nearly empty that morning, I fancy ; I should not think it right to stay away from the Service on that account, but I confess I hardly like the idea of sitting two hours hearing the Master thundering out these statutes. The Master delights in reading them, and always takes the opportunity when the Chapel is most nearly full, because they begin with "Let the Master be the head," which he reads as if he wished to impress it most deeply on the minds of all present. They go on by calling the Dean and

¹ "Earlier Years" Memoir, vol. i. p. 48.

Subdean (Mr. Tait and Mr. Scott) the shoulders; the Fellows continue the body down to the knees; the shins and knees are the Scholars; and the cook and butler are the feet, and thus the body Collegiate is formed.

In spite of the Master's deep-seated antipathy to Blundell Scholars,¹ he made an exception in young Temple's favour:—

To his sister Katy

December 2, 1839.

. . . The Master told me the other day when I had read my essay to him, "A very creditable essay, Mr. Temple, as is everything else you do." The first part is nothing, for he says it to all that have been here a term unless they write something horribly bad, but the last is a very rare addition. He is no bad hand at dealing rebukes, too, when he likes; some time ago a man took him an essay in which the word "always" (it was a Latin essay) was repeated six times in eight lines, upon which the Master said, "An execrable essay; it is like little boys writing 'admiration, admiration' in their copy-books." . . . He is very kind, though, and told me the other day if I wanted any books he would be happy to lend them to me, and such an offer from him is not very easily got.

To his Mother

March 14, 1840.

. . . The Master has been very unwell this week, and consequently for the first time I believe these many years he was not present in Hall when the essays were given in and the Battel Bills delivered. However, at 10 o'clock he contrived to turn out to hear the essays read. One of our Scholars had not been there last week under a false impression that the Master had not returned from London. The consequence was that two essays of his were on the table. "Mr. —," said the Master, "why have you two essays here?" "You have been so irregular, Sir, lately, that my essay was not ready." "I irregular; indeed, Mr. —, you labour under a very great mistake; you would have a higher opinion of my regularity if you were more regular yourself so as to have more opportunity of seeing it. I have made a point of being here even though I am by no means well; it

¹ "Earlier Years" Memoir, vol. i. p. 48.

is you that have been irregular, Mr. ——." The poor Scholar shrunk into his shell in no time; as for the Master, he was evidently much disturbed at the idea of *anybody* by *any* possible means being ignorant of his extraordinary regularity: and he continued to grunt out some half sentences about his regularity under the most adverse circumstances for some time after.

May 23, 1840.

. . . The father of one of our men came up to see Oxford the other day, and Dr. Jenkyns invited him and his son to dinner. During dinner, and while Mrs. Jenkyns was there, the conversation turned upon the administration of the College, and the Master said, "When I made an offer to Mrs. Master" (that is the title he always gives his wife), "I said to her, 'My dear, I want you to be my second wife. I have one wife already, and her I must consider my first—that is my College.' " And I think he has fulfilled his promise certainly.

The Master's sermons were apparently for the most part more practical than theological:—

January 25, 1841.

. . . The Master preached before the University on the Sunday before I came up, and much to the surprise of his hearers the subject was not debt.

The following extracts refer to the well-known picture which now hangs in Balliol Hall, and the engraving of which is a feature on the walls of many a Balliol man:—

To his sister Katy

March 5, 1840.

. . . Wickliffe was once Master of Balliol, and Dr. Jenkyns often talks of his "poor predecessor Wickliffe" as if Wickliffe and himself were the only Masters of Balliol that had ever existed. Wickliffe's picture hangs in our Hall in a corner by itself; it is rather a small one, at least much smaller than all the others.

To his Mother

January 25, 1841.

. . . The Master's picture is put up in the Hall, and certainly is extremely like him, besides being beautifully

painted. . . . An engraving is to be taken of it, and I should think would sell extremely well ; as for myself, I must wait for that pleasure till I can better afford it.

“The Master” had certainly a high opinion of himself, but it was largely due to a sense of the dignity of the College over which he presided. He lived in and for its welfare, as the remark about his wife amusingly illustrates. Though not an able man, he did more for Balliol than many who were very able, and his desire to be identified with it deserved to be gratified, as has indeed been the case. It is not a little remarkable that when Balliol men who were pupils of Dr. Jerkyns speak of their College, their thought and talk invariably run upon the Master. The generation of those who knew him may be said to have almost passed away with the death of Temple, and it is somewhat sad to think that the flow of stories which always ran when Balliol men of his time were gathered together, recalling with amusement but not without affection the tones and sayings of the old Master, will be heard no more.

In his second term begin the frequent comments on individual friends—men to whom he is specially drawn, and from whom in some cases he had received special kindnesses.

To his Mother

February 1, 1840.

I had hardly seen Mr. Scott when I wrote my first letter to you. He was very kind, as indeed he always is, and told me never to hesitate to come to him whenever I had any difficulties of any kind whatever. There is a Living belonging to the College now vacant near Plymouth, worth about £600 a year ; all senior to him have refused it ; whether he will accept it or not I do not know. It will certainly be a serious loss to Balliol if he does, and for myself I cannot tell how much I shall miss him.

Duloe Rectory¹ was for many years like a home to Temple. The following extract describes his first introduction to it, and to Mr. Jelf, of whom Temple saw much during his Oxford career, and whom on grounds both of scholarship and theology it was natural for him to meet in company with Mr. Scott :—

To his Mother

DULOE, September 21, 1840.

The house itself is a very good one : the Library looks so like Scott's room at Oxford that I felt as if I had returned to Oxford, and he has arranged all his books as he had them there. The day after I was introduced to Jelf, and then went out with Scott to Looe ; it is about three miles away. The next day we began work, and I think I have done more in the three days that I have had of it than I could have done in a week at home ; that is the advantage of having plenty of books to go to and a good tutor. The Lexicon is advancing rapidly, but near the end there are two or three very long and tough words to do, and Liddell, who was working for him, fell ill at the thought of them and went away, so that Scott has to depend on himself. Jelf is employed in composing a Greek grammar, which I suppose is to be a most wonderful affair.

The friendship with Jowett did not ripen until after Temple had taken his degree,² but his unusual intellectual attainments had already attracted Temple's attention, and an allusion to his kindness is made in these letters :—

November 19, 1839.

. . . Next week our best man goes in for his examination : his name is Jowett ; he has a Fellowship already, in the competition for which last year he beat several first-class men, so that he has established his fame. I like him very much : he is the most unassuming man I ever saw, without exception. His name is of course pretty well known in the University, and I expect the Schools will be crammed when he is examined. I intend to go and hear it myself, though I do

¹ See "Earlier Years" Memoir, vol. i. p. 50.

² *Ibid.* p. 77.

not often go unless I am much interested in the person to be examined. Our second best man, Northcote, grandson of Sir Stafford Northcote, one of the Blundell Trustees, has been examined already and has succeeded exceedingly well. They will both be first-class men, I suppose. . . .

Jowett told me that if ever I wanted a private tutor he would read with me three times a week, which of course would be a great advantage to me, especially as it is so completely a part of the Oxford system that no one ever thinks of going up for his degree without being under a private tutor, or coach as they call it here, for some time previous. I thanked him, of course, but at the same time told him that I could never think of taking up so much of his time: he, however, begged me not to look at it in that light, as he had received many such kindnesses when he was an undergraduate and now would be only paying back what he had been given. The livings fall vacant very fast certainly; there is one vacancy this term which I am afraid will rob us of our senior tutor, Mr. Tait. I shall be very sorry to lose him, both because he is very kind, and at the same time one of the cleverest metaphysicians in the University.

It was a gratification to Temple when, after Mr. Scott had left Balliol, Tait became his tutor:—

To his Mother

January 1, 1841.

. . . The Tutors have all been enjoying themselves in the country during the vacation; Mr. Tait is my Tutor, I find, which I am rather glad of, as I know and respect him better than any of the rest.¹

Another friend was John Duke Coleridge,² with whom the affinities were great on many sides. Coleridge at the time, like Temple, had Tory sympathies in politics, and was attracted even more than his friend by the Religious Movement at Oxford. How close was the intimacy may be inferred from the following incidental reference in one of his home letters:—

¹ See "Earlier Years" Memoir, vol. i. p. 50.

² Already mentioned, "Exeter" Memoir, vol. i. p. 285.

February 16, 1842.

I am sorry my letter should be a day too late this time, but I have been so much occupied that I have not had five minutes to myself, so that I began with putting off my letter till the last moment and ended with being quite unable to write at all. The reason is that Coleridge, who you know is a great friend of mine, has been dangerously ill, and the doctors ordered that he should not be left alone for a moment; so all my spare time has been taken up with sitting with and reading to him. He is better now than he was, and I believe is not in immediate danger, but is still extremely weak and requires a good deal of nursing.

Later on Coleridge was prevented by this illness from competing in the Honours Schools. In a later letter from Temple we learn of his acting as tutor to his friend in consequence.

His friendship with Matthew Arnold and Arthur Clough¹ began at Oxford; of Mr. Ward (the ideal Ward),² who was destined to exercise no slight influence on Temple's Oxford days, fuller mention will be made later on in a more appropriate connexion. Stanley,³ who ultimately represented the opposite pole of ecclesiastical opinion to Ward, was a later acquaintance, but it is characteristic of Stanley that Temple first met him in Ward's company:—

June 27, 1840.

. . . I went to breakfast with Mr. Ward the other day, and met there the great ornament of the younger portion of Oxford, Stanley, the son of the Bishop of Norwich; he is a man of most astonishing talent. He is going abroad this summer, I believe, into Italy and the Ionian Islands, for he has a brother at Corfu. I went to the Divinity Schools on Thursday to hear him read an essay which has gained him one of the Theological Prizes this year; the subject was that good works do necessarily spring out of a true and lively faith: the essay was exceedingly good as far as I could understand it, but rather beyond me in many parts. He has

¹ See "Earlier Years" Memoir," vol. i. p. 52.

² *Ibid.* p. 50.

³ *Ibid.* p. 80.

not been ordained long, so that it shows he must have a good deal of talent to beat so many older clergymen.

In the midst of his new interests he never forgets home, various expressions of his affection for it coming in as a perpetual interlude :—

To his sister Katy

October 19, 1839.

. . . I saw a place in Cicero to-day where he says that when he is writing he feels as if he were speaking to the person, and when he gets a letter as if he were listening to them, so that when he writes to his own family he likes writing long letters and likes getting long ones too. I could not help thinking that (was like) our letters, though as for Cicero's I sometimes wish them shorter.

His mother is always uppermost in his thoughts, and the little incident narrated below is an amusing illustration of the difference between Temple's view of the limit of obedience and that commonly taken. His mindfulness of his father is also to be noted :—

To his Mother

May 15, 1840.

. . . Six weeks more I have to stay up here and then I shall see you again ; I do wish very much it was over. I am not tired of Oxford particularly, nor of any place in particular, but I am very tired of not seeing you.

May 30, 1840.

. . . I have had a walk with my pupil this evening ; he has some extremely strange notions in his head ; he began chattering about all kinds of things, and at last he asked what I thought was meant by the Commandment to honour your Father and Mother. I said implicit and willing obedience wherever it was not opposed to a higher law ; he battled stoutly against this, and at last put a case which I saw immediately was his own : that supposing his mother had told him not to bathe on a Sunday, whether he must obey her. At last he confessed that his mother had told him not to do so, but that he was very fond of it, and had asked his uncle, without saying anything about his mother, if there was any harm

in it, and he had told him there was no harm in the thing itself, in his opinion, if he did not loiter away his time in consequence or get into bad company; upon this the young gentleman thought himself fully entitled to disobey his mother; and asked me, I believe, just because he felt some compunction and wanted his conscience quieted. He was very anxious to know how long obedience ought to continue; I told him if he constantly obeyed her till he was forty he could judge for himself, but that unless he did so he could never be able to judge, as he would never know except by trying it how much good it did him.

To his sister Katy

May 30, 1840.

I am glad to hear Axon is in such good trim; I shall be sorry to leave the old place, for I feel as if it were Papà's epitaph, at least for me who saw him whilst he was employed in improving it more than in anything else.

The picture of the social life of a College at the time is noteworthy:—

To his Mother

November 11, 1840.

I went last night to a grand dinner party given in the Common Room by Ward, the mathematical Lecturer. There were several Undergraduates there and some of the Tutors. I secured a place by Mr. Tait, and so got a very pleasant evening. Mr. Scott was not there. It was not at all like a Tutor's party, for they are generally made up purposely with a view to mixing the College and preventing the formation of exclusive sets; a good object, no doubt, but the result is very disagreeable; it is by no means agreeable to find yourself in close contact with men whose habits you are eager to avoid, and they on the other hand despise all those who are not like themselves. However, yesterday we were all reading men, and our conversation was not about dogs and horses nor cock-fighting. I got involved in a quiet discussion with Mr. Tait about the National debt; he will have it that it makes us poorer; now I think it makes us much richer at present, and will continue to do so for some time. The result was that neither convinced the other.

The following incident throws light on change of social custom :—

January 25, 1841.

At Bristol we took up an Oxonian and a friend of his, who I soon discovered from the conversation was a Clergyman; he seemed an excellent man, and everything he said seemed to bespeak a thoroughly good heart without any cant about it; but he smoked a cigar all the time, and it did look so unclerical that I could hardly bear to see it; it seems very absurd that such a thing should assume such importance, and I felt that it was not right to think worse of him for it, but somehow or other I could not help feeling also that if he had not been a Clergyman I should have admired more what he said.

Here are words which give the keynote to his views about the responsibilities of his future profession :—

To his sister Katy

What can have taken poor — that he should have imagined himself fit for a Missionary? God works by insignificant instruments, but now everybody seems to think if they are but earnest they are sent by Him. There is something very awful in the words of St. Chrysostom, “I verily believe that very few Clergymen will be saved.” When one considers the duties of the office it seems as if a life spent in preparation were not enough.

Temple came up to Oxford as a young Tory,¹ and he did not discard Toryism as long as he was an undergraduate—indeed, his policy was never to discard but to supplement²—but his whole horizon was enlarged by the atmosphere of Oxford, and the political outlook as part of it. It is evident that two instincts are striving within him for the mastery, and that he no longer sits easy under the old yoke. Principles and not parties are the attraction; new ideas come crowding in, and the arrangement of them, and his own place as the result of them, has

¹ “Earlier Years” Memoir, vol. i. p. 40.

² “Exeter” Memoir, vol. i. p. 280.

not yet been settled. He was through life keenly alive to the making of history, and the awakening of his historical sense may be said to date from the beginning of the late Queen's reign. He followed it throughout with sympathy and admiration. His Oxford letters reveal the germs of ideas which had a lifelong hold upon him—a strong belief in constitutional government, a dislike of the cold and mechanical liberalism of the Whig party, and an aversion to the supremacy of commercial interest in public life. His opinions on the Corn Laws were soon changed. All is formless and immature, but the interest is keen and in some cases (notably the subject of alcohol) the boy is father of the man :—

To his Mother

May 26, 1841.

. . . I have been looking into some of our famous economists lately, and was rather amused at a passage in Sir James Stewart describing a man who kept a farm and a vineyard. The farm was enough to support him and his family ; what he raised from the vineyard he traded with. Stewart remarks on this that when the man is labouring at his vineyard he is benefiting the State, for he furthers the interchange of money and the consequent diffusion of comforts and necessities, but when he works at his farm he is of no advantage to any but his own family, and the State would not feel anything if the man and his farm were swallowed up by an earthquake. I do not know anything more absurd than this deification of the word *State* and sacrifice of all the individuals that compose it. A man does his duty, sets a good example before his neighbours, spreads happiness by his sympathy and kind manner, and yet, because 'he does not trade, but lives entirely on his own ground, it would be no loss if both himself and his estate were swallowed by an earthquake. Let him get a licence and set up a still and make spirits enough to reduce half his neighbours to immorality and begin to trade in it, and then—he is a very useful citizen and the State would feel his loss severely. I have no patience with them. . . . I am afraid we shall have a dissolution and the bad of all the country will be stirred again. What a very false

position Governments are now putting themselves in all over Europe; they are no longer legislative bodies, but Boards of Trade. It amuses me extremely to hear those Whigs defend Oliver Cromwell and his associates on Whig principles; "their acts," we are told, "were quite right, but were not based quite on the right principle: it was absurd in them to fight for liberty of conscience; they ought to have fought for the right of self-taxation, which was the question with which the commotion began." Whatever one may think of the Puritans, they did not define men to be money-making beasts nor degrade themselves into rebels for mere right of taxation.

The following words are a forecast of his sympathy in after years with the practical elevation of social life:—

To his sister Netta

May 31, 1841.

. . . I quite agree with you about providing amusement instead of beer for the poor people on the holidays; indeed I think much more good would be done with some of the Poor Rate if it were applied in that way. A cricket ground and a place to play football would, I am sure, find many visitors who would otherwise go to the public-house, and it would not be difficult to prevent liquors being brought near the place.

II. To turn from the general picture and the sidelights to the more strictly educational side of the undergraduate days.

The strain is great even for him:—

To his Mother

November 22, 1839.

. . . They do work one tremendously hard certainly if one is willing to work. Mr. Ward is I think the only one of the Tutors that does not urge me to work, but he does what has the same effect, for he sets me as much as I can possibly do, and then wonders how I can get through it, and says it would kill him to work so hard. Mr. Scott, when he talks to me upon that subject, always tells me to work, but adds that I must take warning by him and not overdo the matter. That I think is example without precept. However, I hope regularity in taking rest and exercise will preserve my health without much danger.

At an earlier period than usual under the present system of University education (his first year) he begins to study Aristotle and others of the old philosophers, and speaks about them with simple religiousness:—

To his sister Katy

November 19, 1839.

. . . I am reading Aristotle's Ethics now, and am plunging deep into the theories of the various philosophers of that day. . . . I often think that those ancient writers were gifted with talents in some respects superior even to the brightest intellects of modern times, to show us that, however highly gifted, man could never attain to the most imperfect knowledge of our relation to the Deity. . . . They went as far as man could go, and it was useless for them to push any further. Nothing, I think, tends more to humble one's ideas of human powers than to see such mighty minds completely baffled in such researches.

Before long he makes acquaintance with the great modern thinkers:—

To his sister Katy

February 1, 1840.

. . . I have been reading lately a very clever work by a man called Carlyle, the deepest thinker of the day without exception. It is on Chartism, and very beautiful but rather idealistic. The general tone of the books now published has, I think, that character; it comes from Germany and therefore looks still more suspicious.

Wordsworth he greatly admired and his admiration increased, but the tendency to Pantheistic thought was somewhat of a stumbling-block to his susceptibilities at first:—

To his sister Katy

October 24, 1840.

I have got Wordsworth's "Excursion" without much difficulty, and when I come home again you shall have that to read as well as the pleasure of seeing me. I like it better the more I read it, but there is a very great fault in it; it

has a decided tendency to Pantheism or that philosophy which looks upon the Deity as the life of the world and not having an essentially extramundane existence; it does not jar upon one's feelings like Atheism, which sweeps away all one's higher nature and turns one into a calculating animal, but it tends very much to substitute a dreamy rapture for the duties of religion. It is so very slight in Wordsworth and so clothed in poetry that you would hardly see it, and at any rate not enough to influence you in the least, so do not think I am warning you against him. As an instance of what I mean, in a very beautiful passage he describes a person looking out upon a fine view with the sun rising before him as

Rapt into still communion that transcends
The imperfect offices of prayer and praise.¹

Now the mistake is that from the corruption of our nature this rapturous state would be much more felt by a person of great intellectual taste and refinement though of no religion than by a true but uncultivated Christian.

Upon S. T. Coleridge, Temple's mind was largely built. A spiritual philosophy such as that of Coleridge appealed very strongly to his own characteristics; and the revolt which Coleridge, following Kant, ultimately led against the materialistic and sensational school of Locke and Hartley² found in Temple a ready adherent. The influence of Coleridge—the close connexion which that philosopher maintained between morality and religion, the large place assigned by him to the human will, his insistence upon the Practical Reason as the surest foundation on which to base religion, and his conviction that the best proof of Christianity was to be found, not, as Paley taught, in external evidence, but in the correspondence of its Doctrines with the deepest things in human nature—all this is easily recognised by those who are well acquainted with Dr. Temple's mind and writings. His admiration began early :—

¹ Wordsworth's "Excursion," Book I.

² Shairp's *Studies in Poetry and Philosophy*, p. 190.

To his sister Katy

May 20, 1841.

. . . I have been reading Coleridge a good deal lately and I can hardly tell how much I admire him; I have a sort of feeling, however, that this admiration cannot last long. Reading him excites me so much that I can hardly do anything else after it; I am obliged never to read it except just before I am going to walk. What a wonderful power of conversation he must have had; no subject seems to have baffled him.

The strain of the work is too much for him at times:—

To his Mother

November 30, 1840.

I am so sorry that I forgot about that Form of Thanksgiving, and indeed it has gone out of my head so utterly that I have not at this moment the least recollection of your asking for it, nor can I find your letter, so that I am rather in doubt what form you mean. I hope you will not think me very careless, but the fact is I have been nearly driven wild this week by having so much mathematics to read, besides the unavoidable interruption occasioned by Lawson's being here. Last night I could not sleep with those abominable Problems running in my head, which I suppose was caused by leaving off all of a sudden on the Sunday after reading so hard all the week. As Mr. Scott was not going to be here again I thought I ought to make the most of his presence and worked with him alone all the time, and now all the other College work has come upon me all at once.

As the time of his final examination draws near the strain of work still increases:—

To his Mother

May 4, 1841.

. . . I have so much to do now that I am eleven hours a day at my work, and I do not think an additional hour's work would be good for me, and as yet I see no prospect of my business diminishing.

But he undertakes the additional burden of a second

trial for the Ireland Scholarship, though somewhat against the grain :—

... I have begun working for the Ireland, though I cannot say I have much taste for it; two or three years ago I could have felt well contented to pass my life in discussing the force of an expression or the meaning of a word, but now I feel somehow as if this were very frivolous work, and I have hardly patience to sit down and compose Latin verses or translate bits of Shakespeare into Greek: however, I think I owe it to Mr. Sanders and to my Tutors here to try for the Scholarship, and it will be no bad moral lesson to practise one's duty in small things and things that look unworthy of attention; one thing I am quite sure is not to be gained, generally speaking, by any other method—that is the habit of attending to what one is about and not allowing the mind to wander even for an instant.

With the exception of divinity he cared more for mathematics than for any other study :—¹

None of my work has such a hold upon me as mathematics; with much of the rest, except the Divinity, I feel as if it was such a barren work, but in this I get so interested that I cannot stop to think about that.

This year (1841) Balliol failed in the Schools, a thing which seemed miraculous to the College authorities :—

May 31, 1841.

I can hardly describe the state of amazement Balliol is in at present in consequence of our utter failure this year in the Class List. We had five men in, three of whom were trying for first classes and two were thought quite certain, another for a second, and another for what he could get. Fancy our amazement when our two best men came out in the second class, the doubtful man in the third, and the two last in the fourth. You must know that the open Balliol Scholars have never missed being in the First Class yet, and consequently it has been looked upon quite as a point of honour to keep the line unbroken. Two of our scholars were in this time, one, Clough, a very clever man, and the other —,

¹ See "Earlier Years" Memoir, vol. i. p. 57.

who has been idle and caused some anxiety. Clough is without exception the cleverest, deepest-thinking man I know anywhere, and I should not hesitate to say had as much talent as all the examiners put together, for I know them personally ; yet I do not doubt that they were right as far as his papers went, for I feel very sure the reason Clough failed was because he looked for more meaning in the questions than they were intended to have, and certainly nothing *looks* more stupid than a man attempting to dive when the water does not reach his ankles. I shall have little faith in the Class Lists now as tests of men's talents. The shout of triumph at the failure of Balliol was certainly rather mortifying . . . they exclaim that our acknowledged best man had been floored. You may judge of the character he has here from the way in which the news was received ; Mr. Tait, my Tutor, declared that it was discreditable only to the Examiners ; the Master proposed instantly to demand an investigation ; and the Undergraduates in general considered it to be a piece of double-dealing. . . . I know the Examiners too well to suspect the least unfairness, besides the utter absurdity of supposing they would run such a risk, but I do think the examination must have been a very bad one. There was one fellow as stupid as any man who had actually taken in ten books, and six of them he had never opened, and yet they never found it out, but let him get into the third class. I am very much vexed about Clough, as I never met a man I admired so much, though I do not think he will care much for it : I cannot say I grieve much for the College, for Balliol men have gradually got into an idea that however hard a thing it may be for other Colleges, for them it is but a slight matter to get a First, so that pride has had a fall.

This failure was in measure redeemed by Jowett's success in winning the University Latin Essay.

Tired fits intervene sometimes, and with them longings for home :—

I am getting rather tired of Oxford (he writes at the end of May) and anxious to get home ; though I suppose I must accustom myself to conquer this weariness, as I shall have to stay here still longer sometimes. I never get tired of staying at home somehow or other, but this summer I shall have more to do than ever.

In the summer he tries a change to Duloe for the sake of Mr. Scott's friendship and help ; but the work does not slacken, and neither he nor the writer of the *Lexicon* has a moment to spare :—

DULOE, *September 29, 1841.*

. . . We have been jogging on just as before hitherto, but to-day some of Mr. Scott's friends are coming here and we shall be a houseful ; I am rather sorry for it as it will be somewhat of an interruption to work, though I think we are working rather too much just at present. . . . I have been trying to perform Katy's commands and write something for Mrs. Pigot's album, but I really do not know how I am to manage it ; I am at work by half-past five in the morning and do not leave off except for breakfast till between three and four in the afternoon, and then have an exercise every evening that takes me a couple of hours to do ; and really in the intermediate time my head is not in the exact condition for such work as writing for ladies' albums. As for asking Mr. Scott, I had as soon think of cutting my head off : with four-and-twenty pages of *Lexicon* to write every week, besides his parish work, he never has a moment to spare.

In the next term calculations about prospective Class Lists come in :—

October 1, 1841.

. . . I have been working at Herodotus latterly, and I never read him without being more and more pleased with him, and I am sure, though I have read the book through twice before and though I have to stop to examine grammatical constructions and dates, which is a sad impediment to the story, I never took so much interest in any of Scott's novels. Whether the style does one good or not is a question, but I am inclined to think it does. It quiets one's mind so much to be carried gently on without an effort and taken completely out of one's self. But it makes rather a sharp change when I have to turn from him to mathematics.

At last the crisis of the triple contest (Ireland Scholarship, Classical and Mathematical Schools) is reached. First comes the Ireland :—

February 3, 1842.

I am very sorry indeed to have kept your letter waiting this week, but I have been so busy the last few days that I have not had five minutes to spare. The fact is the Ireland examination is going on and I am in as you know I intended : the examination has hitherto been very useful to me, but not quite on the line in which I am best prepared, so that I fear that I have small chance of getting it. The work is tremendous, and this morning though everybody was cold I was in such a state from exerting myself that I was quite in a perspiration when I came out. However, I am quite well except that I feel very tired in the evenings.

He does not win it, but he betters his place of the previous year and achieves a great success :—

Roundell Palmer, one of the Ireland examiners, called on me the other day and said that I was very near the Ireland but had failed in the Latin verses, telling me at the same time that he considered my scholarship of a much more valuable kind than that of any one else in the examination, and that he had never before “seen such depth of thought applied to the analysis of language.” He has said this openly, so that it is pretty well known, and as far as Oxford goes and myself I am as well satisfied as if I had got it, but I am rather sorry because of Sanders, as a Tiverton man’s being Ireland would be something for him, but being second is nothing.

The ordeal of the Schools is more prolonged :—

April 6, 1842.

. . . The Schools open on the 15th : the Pass men go in first, and the candidates for Honours, as they are called, go in after the others have done, so that we shall probably commence about the 25th. We have five days’ examination on paper and then go in to the Vivâ Voce Examination, which will begin about the 2nd or 3rd of May. I shall probably be in about the second day. Then I shall have about three weeks to read for the Mathematical Schools, which also last five days. The Class List comes out on the Saturday before Whit Sunday.

April 13.

The list of candidates is out and I find there are 295 in, 51 of which are candidates for Honours. . . .

May 2.

I am just out of the Schools and it is all over. I cannot tell my fate of course, but I think I am all safe, for they thanked me for everything. . . .

May 4.

I am so glad my work is over, enough for me to sit down and write you a letter again; all my part is done now and the thing is probably settled, but I shall know nothing more till the Class List is produced. They are getting over their work most rapidly, and I dare say the list will be out this day week. . . . I hardly like to look forward or backward now. I was in a very desponding state on Friday evening, because I thought I had done my history very ill, but I cannot help thinking if I had done very badly the Paper work they would not have been so civil in the other examination. The first Paper we had was some English to turn into Latin, which I believe I did not do very badly; then came the translation from Greek into English, which I know I did quite *accurately*, though I cannot say much for the elegance of it: the next Paper was the Logic, like Oxford Logic, great nonsense, and as I am sure I do not profess much facility in writing clever nonsense (which you know, *mamina*, is the highest reach of talent) I did not do any great things. In the afternoon we had translations from Latin into English, which I did without much difficulty: the next day came the moral philosophy, and if either quantity or clearness is a good thing I am sure I ought to have half a dozen first classes, but it is by no means easy to elicit much *depth* of thought from one's brain at such a time; however, I think I did it very fairly. In the afternoon we had a piece of English to turn into Greek, and that I did not find much difficulty in accomplishing: the next day came the Moral Essay on the independent existence of Justice and Moral Beauty; and in this I succeeded pretty well and have been nearly told so by one of the Examiners: but in the afternoon came the History, and I never was more completely floored, as the expression is, in my whole life. I found those tiresome dates had slipped my memory most horribly: at the same time I think it a very bad paper, for it consisted principally in an examination on the unimportant parts of the history on the supposition, I conclude, that if we had observed and could recollect the unimportant parts, it would be probable we also knew the important ones. It was very

provoking, for I knew the leading principles and turning-points of the history as well as possible, and I never had any taste for collecting scraps with nothing in them but bare facts. The remaining papers were comparatively unimportant. In the morning (we had) a critical paper which I did some of, but it will be of little use to me comparatively, for neither of the Examiners is a good judge of knowledge of that kind; and in the afternoon a Latin speech against the policy of Pericles, which I did pretty well, I think. On the whole, the only important papers which I think I failed in are the History and the Logic; but then they are very important, and might well bring me from the first class to the second. On Saturday all day I employed myself in learning the Articles, which I managed to accomplish.

The Vivâ Voce Examination was at that time more in the nature of a full-dress debate than under present conditions:—

. . . On Monday morning I got up early and read over my analysis, but to little purpose, for I was in too excited a state to do anything: about ten, having enveloped my neck in a white neckcloth and a pair of bands, and otherwise made myself smart, I proceeded to the Schools. The first thing they gave me (I came third), while the other men were being examined, was a piece of Plato to translate, then a piece of Aristotle (the first very easy, the last the hardest bit of Greek prose of the kind I know), and then a bit of Terence, and about a quarter past one I was called up: the crowd in the Schools was immense, and I could see the examiner, Hanswell, was as nervous as I was: when I commenced I could hardly speak. I had to construe the story of the death of John the Baptist. Then I was taken into the proofs of the Resurrection, then to the history of the Kings of Israel and the captivities. I soon found that the Examiner was not very deep, and that by framing my answers carefully I might get any questions I liked. I tried it once or twice and found it quite easy, but my conscience smote me and I did not try it again; you may imagine I was beginning to be collected when I came to this, but I was by no means so when I came to the philosophy. The divinity having passed off so comfortably I was getting more easy when he begged me to sit down (the Examiner and the examined always stand during the divinity examination) and desired me to construe

a piece of Aristotle he pointed out: I was in a desperate fright: it is the hardest place of the whole book (not to construe, for that is quite easy, but to trace the argument), and, moreover, I do not think Aristotle is right: he wishes to prove against Plato that in some cases it is a *duty* to seek one's own pleasure as an end. I do not think it ever is, though I think it often a duty to seek certain pleasures as a *means* to bringing one's own mind into a better state: however, I construed the place and was then asked to trace the argument; I did so; and then I expected a searching examination, when he ran off into questions about what Plato said and what Butler said till I was quite in a rage with him. I had no desire for display in itself, but there were a great many there come to hear me, and I knew my hopes of pupils would depend greatly on what sort of appearance I made in the Schools, and I should certainly have liked questions which could have shown that I had not only read my books but thought about them too; however, I did not miss any of his questions except one stupid one, which he was evidently ashamed of having asked: the thing was so obvious that I could not understand what he meant. Well, he made me a low bow and handed me to the next: —, who is a cleverer man but a very disagreeable examiner; I had to construe some Herodotus, some Thucydides, and some Tacitus. He stopped me pretty nearly at every word because he thought some other better, and I got quite angry with him. In the history I was quite ready for him and only missed one question, and several times gave him answers which evidently contained more than he knew himself; once he floored me very severely in the history of Augustus, but it was natural enough, for it is not within my books and I have had no time for extra reading for the last year: he tried several times to catch me in the constructions of the sentences, but I am quite at home there, and the only time he thought he had done so I was so evidently right that one of the other examiners whispered to him to let me alone, and he let me do it my own way. Meanwhile, Hanswell, who had gone out as soon as he had done with me, came in again with a whole heap of ladies, and they came just as I was being handed over with another bow, "Thank you, Sir," to Eden, the remaining tormentor: he gave me a bit of Aristophanes; the moment I saw it I knew my troubles were over, for it was a part I knew thoroughly; though by no means easy, it was very comic, and I was enough at ease to translate

it so as to keep them all laughing all the time, and I then had a bit of Homer and was dismissed. . . .

I am so glad it is all over. I am now going to work as hard at Mathematics, harder indeed, for a few days' work at Classics is a trifle compared to a day's Mathematics. The mathematical examination begins on the 23rd and will be over about the 28th, I suppose.

May 11.

This evening I hope the Class List will be out in time for me to send you a copy or at least tell my own fate. I have been reading Mathematics since I wrote last and have had very little time on my hands, or I should not give you so short a letter. I am quite well, I am thankful to say, and I think on the whole reading for my degree has done my health no injury. The extremely regular habits it forced me into and the violent exercise I was obliged to take to keep up my spirits for such constant application have, I think, quite made up for any ill effects which might otherwise have arisen. My mathematical examination has prevented me from relaxing so much as I could wish, but next Monday I am going to have a holiday and I am going to visit Eton with Jelf.

The result is out before the post leaves, and the son adds the Class List in one last glad sentence, like a stop-press telegram of modern days:—

The Class List is just out: the first class is as follows (alphabetically arranged, you know):—

Andrews, Worcester.
Bernard, Trinity.
De Teissier, Corpus Christi.
Fanshawe, Balliol.
Temple, Balliol.
Tweed, Exeter.
Wayte, Trinity.

Good-bye, love to all. Your most affectionate son,

F. TEMPLE.

I will write again to-morrow. "

The above letters recording the success were for home consumption. They can be supplemented by

the following account sent to Mr. Scott and written from the pupil's rather than the son's point of view :—

HÔTEL DES ÉTRANGERS, TILFF, PRÈS DE LIÈGE,
June 16, 1842.

MY DEAR SIR— . . . The Translations were not particularly hard. When the day for Vivâ Voce came I was in no small fright; I thought I should be able to get up some little things before I went in, but it was all in vain; I could not command my attention. I read over two or three analyses, and then found that after reading an analysis of Livy I fancied I had been reading one of Butler: altogether I was quite bewildered. However, my brains got pretty clear by the time I had been a quarter of an hour in the Schools, and though still nervous I knew pretty well what I was about. I was called up at last and had to stand before Hanswell for the terrific questions. He bored me extremely by asking extremely superficial questions, such as I should think he must have been in the habit of teaching his pupils out of Cram books, but his manner was extremely kind. I amused myself a little whilst it was going on by keeping my eyes on Tait, who was sitting beside him. Not having ever intended to have a coach in science I had got up his Ethic Lecture when I was in it with great care, so that I answered many of Hanswell's questions with Tait's own words. He recognised them instantly, and on each occasion looked at Hanswell to see what effect they would have, and now and then seemed to think Hanswell extremely stupid when he did not appreciate them immediately. . . . The mathematical examination worked me much more severely than the classical: I had not looked at Cat Dat Eat Fat since Christmas, and when I commenced immediately after the other List came out I felt so unstrung and quite unfit for any violent exertion, so that I really did very little; then when the examination came on and I was in the midst of these questions all my old overpowering interest in them returned upon me, and I can safely say I did not sleep above a dozen hours all the four nights—the last of them I did not close my eyes: I was quite done when I left Oxford. . . . I left Oxford the moment I could after the Mathematical Class List was out, which was on the Friday, and reached home early Saturday morning: that day I had to call upon my Culmstock friends: on Monday I had an old standing engagement with Sanders to spend the day with him in Tiverton, and on Tuesday I had to

be off to London to meet my sister coming from Brussels, and on Thursday I sailed myself.

III. Great interest attaches to Temple's undergraduate career from its educational side,—the gradual enlargement of view, the great triumph won at last by the steady, strenuous work. But there is yet fuller and higher interest in the religious side of the Oxford life. Much has been written about the Movement; but Temple's Oxford home letters are probably unique in giving a picture of it from the undergraduate point of view. They show the attitude towards it of a simple, religiously minded youth, trained up in a country home which was surrounded more or less by the atmosphere of the evangelical school of thought, but had its chief characteristic in an old-fashioned and practical piety confined to no special party. In spiritual things Frederick Temple was the ideal child of such a home, and without doubt the influence which the Oxford School exercised upon him was great, and in many ways permanent. It is a mistake to imagine that the essential thing in Temple's nature was practical directness;¹ he eventually gave himself to public affairs and practical life because he schooled himself to them, but his earliest love was in deeper things, and Jowett and others were disposed to think that his ultimate choice of official life was a renunciation of high possibilities. As a child he used to get away from the rest to be alone with his books. At school religious things had a special attraction for him. His friend, Robert Lawson, had something of the poetic vein in him, and as a boy was Temple's companion in walks through the lanes and by the brooks which surround Tiverton. Young Temple's love for his home combined

¹ "Earlier Years" Memoir, vol. i. p. 83.

with love for its inmates a good deal of love for the beautiful country around it. One who was much his companion in journeys through Devonshire in after years saw that this love of nature was perpetually coming up. Coleridge and Wordsworth, the poets of nature on its religious side, were his favourite authors; his love for this school of poetry lent itself to a taste for mysticism and metaphysics—"I am obliged to confess," he tells his son William, "that from seventeen to five-and-twenty I indulged largely in such (religious) speculations." But his love for these subjects dated further back: "The Authoress of the *Fairy Bower* is rather censured," he writes to his sister Katy, "for making a girl of not ten years old think on metaphysical subjects, but I am sure I used to think about such things as Infinity and Eternity and Space as long ago as I can remember, so I do not think it at all unnatural."¹

Fear of "getting among the Puseyites" he gives in one of his home letters while at Blundell's School as a reason for going to Cambridge rather than Oxford; but it was quite certain that in one way or another—whether in the direction of attraction or repulsion—he would be interested in the Oxford Movement. There is scarcely a letter written home, in his undergraduate days, in which he does not refer to it. The Movement is more interesting to him than even his work, and indeed it colours his work and enters into his views about it and the persons connected with it. Three things are most apparent:—

(1) That up to a certain point and period it has an increasing hold upon him.

(2) That the influence is entirely due to the religious and spiritual side of the Movement—the idea of self-sacrifice, the other worldliness and

¹ Temple's Oxford Letters, February 12, 1841.

spiritual tone—while its contentions and mannerisms are an offence to him.

(3) That he has a great desire springing from his sense of justice that, whether unpopular or not, it should be fairly treated and account should be taken of its merits as well as its demerits.

The very first letter from Oxford shows from what side his interest in such a movement would spring. One chief attraction of Oxford to him was always in its daily round of services,¹ and the quiet order of its religious life. The first and almost the last of his letters home as an undergraduate dwell on the subject :—

To his Mother

April 12, 1839.

. . . I like having the Church prayers in the Chapel morning and evening very much. There is certainly external devotion observable if there is nothing else, and this shows that respect is paid to religion by all, even those who perhaps understand it least. In Church too I never heard a more complete silence than prevailed during the sermon; this perhaps may be partly owing to the beautiful manner of the preacher, for there was not so much as a cough to be heard. A Clergyman of Corpus Christi preached yesterday morning (I do not know his name); his sermon was against the confidence arising from religious knowledge without practical holiness, and illustrated by the example of Balaam; it was very powerfully written. My servant misinformed me about the time of the afternoon service, telling me it was half-past two instead of two. I was too late, but, however, I went in and heard the end of the sermon. There are no prayers in the University Church, only a psalm and the sermon, each College has prayers for itself in the College Chapel. Nor are the men obliged to attend; they must go to their Chapel but they need not go to Church. The Church, however, was very full, for it was not thought respectable to stay away.

He was a constant attendant at University sermons, but it is evident that the future Bampton

¹ "Earlier Years" Memoir, vol. i. p. 54.

Lecturer at first preferred simpler words to learned discourses :—

To his Mother

April 24, 1839.

. . . On Sunday we had a Bampton Lecture in the Church at the morning Service. I am almost sorry such things should be done on the Sunday. This Lecture was one of the most learned sermons that I suppose could have been preached ; but then there was not even a moral much less a religious deduction from it, as far as concerns practice. It was treating religion as a science, not as a duty or a blessing. On Sunday evenings there are Lectures in the College Chapels on the Catechism, and they began with us last Sunday. Mr. Scott is our Catechetical Lecturer (as he is called), and his lecture was particularly beautiful.

It is soon evident what is the kind of religion that will attract him :—

To his Mother

May 8.

I dined yesterday with Mr. Gordon and was very much pleased ; he seems a truly religious man, and one who above all others mixes religion with his daily practice and conversation. He has not much work, at least if one may judge from the nature of his parish ; for all his parishioners, in number about 200, are within ten minutes' walk of his house, except two families who do not live quite so near. At the same time, though only three miles from Oxford, he is completely retired, and he always says that nothing is a greater blessing to the place than the badness of the roads ; it separates his parish from the town more than anything else could do. The people are all Church people and all, according to his account, exceedingly willing to gratify him in anything from respect to his office. It is rather rarely, I think, that one meets with a feeling of that kind so prevalent. I have not made many acquaintances, nor indeed have I improved my acquaintance with those I already know, except with Tickell whom I like exceedingly. He is not of the same opinions as myself on many points, but what I admire in him so much, and what is here exceedingly rare, is that he respects the opinions of those from whom he differs, and does not immediately call one a fool, as most persons here

would, though not in express words, yet implying it very plainly. At the same time he is very seriously disposed ; and not only that, but puts the opinions of right and wrong into practice, which is not very common in Oxford I am sorry to say, since I know many men profess to hold strong opinions but never act upon them.

The Oxford atmosphere was charged at the time with controversy, and it distressed him to find that in consequence religion had become an almost impossible subject of conversation :—

To his Mother

November 4, 1839.

. . . Religious conversation is rather discountenanced by the Dons when they observe it ; this is in fact a relic of the old system, and certainly it was very right when in the majority of instances religion was only mentioned to be ridiculed, or, to say the best, to be thought of lightly ; but now when the tone of feeling is so changed, when religion is revered, perhaps in many cases for fashion's sake, but still it is revered outwardly at least by the most serious and by the least so, I think it a pity that such feelings should be checked. When it degenerates into mere dispute about religious parties of course it should not be encouraged, but I think the one might be repressed without necessarily involving the other ; people might surely talk about the Bible and its promises and commands without immediately making allusions to Pusey and Newman, and Head and the Bishop of Exeter.

It is evident that there are characteristics in the Puseyites which will appeal to him :—

To his sister Netta

May 22, 1839.

. . . The Pusey party are the quietest, most unobtrusive set you can imagine ; they have been much misrepresented, and that of course helps rather than injures them ; they are exceedingly clever men, and decidedly, as far as man can judge, they embody the chief part of the religious portion of Oxford. After this you will easily imagine how they can get on ; while their most pernicious doctrines are defended from their character of religion and talent, or concealed beneath this external plausibility, it must be extremely

difficult to check them. Besides this, their opponents, by confounding themselves with the Low Church party, have ranged against them those who would be their most zealous and useful assistants.

And so he begins to study the party a little more closely, to see how far they are justly attacked :—

To his sister Netta

October 19, 1839.

Do you know I have been reading several of the Tracts for the Times, and I think the authors would be very much astonished to hear the opinions that are ascribed to them, not only by their opponents but by their own followers and admirers. I think they have done incalculable mischief by wording their opinions so incautiously and so strongly that the natural sense of their writings is very different from what they meant to express. One in particular is the Chapter on Reserve in communicating Religious Knowledge, in which any one at first reading would think that the Author decidedly condemned preaching the doctrine of the Atonement ; but, on the contrary, this very man is noted for bringing forward the Atonement in his Parish Sermons at every opportunity ; it appears that what he meant to inculcate is the preaching of something more definite to the people than is commonly done. To preach on particular duties and refer them to the general principle of the Atonement seems to be what he wishes to advise ; not to tell people to leave their sins and follow the Lord, which is, he thinks, too general for them to understand, but to point out particular duties and then to guard against the supposition that these have any merit, but to point out how necessarily they spring from Love, while the Atonement, as the especial motive for that love, is the only means of our salvation. This I think is plausible enough, though I cannot say that I by any means agree with it entirely. Still it is a great pity that leading men who can write so beautifully as they do should not be more careful not to mislead others.

The leaders of the party soon become objects of interest to him, but the only one with whom he was brought into close personal contact appears to have been Mr. Ward, whom he already knew

as his mathematical lecturer.¹ Ward's was not the influence in the Movement which appealed to the deepest things in Temple's nature, but at the time, as was natural in a keen and alert young student, Temple was greatly taken by the genius and enthusiasm of the man—his dialectical skill, his fearlessness, his good-nature and genial friendliness, the impetuous onset of his attacks, his very recklessness and disregard for consequences. Some trace of the influence may be seen in the thoroughness, and distaste for the merely expedient, which were never absent from Temple even in later years. He walked with Ward and dined with him repeatedly. Abuses in the English Church and the faulty theology of the English Articles were special subjects with Ward, and it is not difficult to guess from Temple's home letters what Ward had been talking about when he last dined or walked with him.

To his Mother

May 15, 1840.

. . . I dined the other day with Mr. Ward in his rooms; he is such a strange man sometimes. He gave me the history of half a dozen of the Patron Saints of the Colleges, and he was quite shocked at the Trustees of Blundell's for altering the Meeting-day from the day of the Patron Saint; he said he thought it very wrong to allow that day to be unnoticed in the School, and that if the Meeting-day had not been altered there might have been some hope at some future time of commemorating the day in a more suitable manner, but that now it would probably soon be forgotten that the School ever had a Patron Saint.

To his Mother

February 8, 1841.

. . . On Thursday I had a walk with Mr. Ward, the Mathematical Master; we went to Littlemore Chapel (Newman's Chapel), where he had promised to do duty, and on the way he talked of the everlasting subject the Church;

¹ "Earlier Years" Memoir, vol. i. p. 51.

I was very much surprised to hear him speak very harshly of the Church of Rome; and he said he was quite aware of the abominable corruptions in it, but that he could not bear that the English should speak as if our Church were in a much better state. He asked me if I had ever read Newman's Sermons, and I told him that I had read the first three volumes but not the rest; so on Saturday he sent me the fourth and fifth with a request that I would keep them. In the fifth I find Newman enters into the question of venial and mortal sins, and his doctrine is almost the same with that of Wesley, except that he holds regeneration to take place in Baptism, whilst Wesley, you know, considers this to take place at the moment of Conversion, which they all hold so strongly. I confess I cannot agree with Newman, but I have time yet to make up my mind, and I trust God will help me. Though Wesley and Newman set out from the same principles, their results are very different, and I never could compare the free and easy religion of the Wesleys, who generally think religion to consist in rapturous emotions, to the severe, stern self-watching and self-denial which Newman holds, and which I believe is the religion of the Bible. The Papists are certainly beating us in this respect.

The remarks about Newman and Wesley had evidently been received with some questioning at home, and the following week he writes:—

To his Mother

February 12, 1841.

. . . I did not say Newman held anything in common with Wesley but his opinions about sins of Infirmity and transgression; they both hold that in the state of Grace we commit no sins but those of infirmity, such I mean that in the very act of committing them we dislike and abhor them; and, indeed, there are many passages in the Bible which are very difficult to explain on any other hypothesis, such are that "he that is born of God sinneth not"; that those who left the Church and went into heresies were "not of the Church, or they would have remained with the Church." However, Newman and Wesley differ utterly in their views in reference to this state of grace. Newman says that you cannot know whether you are in it or not; that you are put into it by Baptism, but that any sin of trans-

gression will throw you from it, nor can you return except by Repentance; nay, that even the Communion itself is only still more sin unless you have so repented, and repented, he seems to say, not of your sins in general, but of that sin in particular. Wesley, on the contrary, held that the state of grace began with conversion, and that you could know whether or not you were in it, and though you fell from it, yet with God's grace you might recover. Can you wonder that Newman is so gloomy when he believes that a forgotten sin may exclude him from future mercy, or at least if he does not believe it, suspects that it may be so? The Wesleyans, on the contrary, if they can but raise in their minds the animal excitement, which I believe in a very little while a clever man will be able to give with a galvanic shock, and do not commit any glaring sin, fancy they are all safe. It is quite remarkable what different appearances are presented by the different sides of the error, for I cannot think it anything else.

In the October term of his first year he came for the first time under the spell of Dr. Pusey's preaching, and as illustrating what the following letter says as to Dr. Pusey's power of holding the attention of young hearers for a lengthened time, it may be mentioned that twenty years afterwards Dr. Temple told a pupil about to enter Oxford, "If you hear Pusey he will preach for over an hour and you will think he has only been speaking for a few minutes." Shortly afterwards the pupil listened *standing* to Dr. Pusey for more than an hour.

To his Mother

November 19, 1839.

Last Sunday Dr. Pusey preached before the University at the Cathedral. I do not think I ever heard a more beautiful sermon. He spoke very strongly against the increasing luxury of Oxford, even though dissipation was diminishing; and he observed that whilst the senior parts of the University countenance this by their example, it would be useless to say anything to the younger members. He ended with a warning to those who are studying Divinity not to suppose that they could get such knowledge by mere

intellectual exercise of the mind; that it required a high degree of moral training even to understand these truths, and that such knowledge was not to be obtained by anything but the gift of the Almighty: the true way to study Divinity would be not to read day and night, but to add to your studies a life of prayer and practical holiness. The sermon lasted nearly two hours, but I could have listened more than an hour longer, I am sure. The precepts he gave us were certainly beautiful, and I trust I shall not soon forget them. The explanations he gave us incidentally of the attacked tenets of his party were certainly such that no Churchman could possibly dissent from them; but I confess I doubt whether any impartial person would have got that meaning from the Tracts. I do not mean to accuse them of insincerity in their explanations, but only that their writings are expressed in such strong language that no one but themselves can understand them.

. . . Dr. Pusey preached last Sunday at the University Church, but I was not able to go; there was of course a very large audience. He preached on the approaching season of Lent, and strongly recommended that we should abstain from giving parties or joining in convivialities, but rather try if possible to fix our minds on the coming Fast day, the great Day of Atonement in the Christian Church. Many, however, who are very forward in defence of those of Pusey's doctrines which would save people the trouble of searching for the truth, cannot agree when he recommends abstinence and frequent Prayer. Several are much offended with him because he spoke of the Romish Church and Protestant Sects, including apparently under the latter denomination all Protestants not belonging to the English Church. I certainly think the same words sound very differently from different persons, and what in some would be thought merely a casual remark, in others is considered as an evidence of character. . . . There are a great many parties now; I have had one myself this morning, and must have one again next Thursday. However I may disagree with Dr. Pusey, I think it certainly can do no harm if I give no parties during Lent; and besides, perhaps those I wished to ask might be of his opinion, and then they would either come against their own feeling or tell the reason, which few of them, I think, would like. So, all things considered, I think it will be better if I get over all my parties before Lent begins.

There was that in the gravity and earnest tone of personal religion in Pusey's sermons which specially appealed to Temple. Of all the University preachers of his day he was the one who most spoke as "having authority" for him. If Ward attracted Temple, Pusey impressed him. Ward appealed to the intellectual side of Temple, but the gravity, the learning, the serious religious tone of Dr. Pusey spoke to what was strongest and deepest in him—the moral nature—and he always speaks of him with a special tone of respect. But the sermons did not always ring quite true to his ears :— .

To his Mother

October 2, 1840.

Not that I would accuse him for a moment of not holding to the truth in its full extent ; but I think it is a pity that such a man should use expressions which have been so long abused as now to mislead people when rightly used. . . .

The first mention of Dr. Pusey is closely followed by an account of the first impressions made by Dr. Newman :—

To his Mother

December 2, 1839.

. . . Last Sunday we had the Communion in our chapel, and in consequence were not out in time for the University sermon. I went to Mr. Newman's service, which was the only one open so late, but he did not preach. He has a very musical voice and great command over it, but I confess I do not like his tone ; he *whines* so very much. His manner of reading is, however, generally admired. He is an exceedingly ugly man, and his features are the hardest I ever saw ; his face looks as if it were made of board, and he has the appearance of very great austerity. The reading-desk he uses consists merely of an upright stand with a slope for the book and a kneeling cushion before it ; there is no seat at all. It is in fact what they call a faldstool. I have seen his Church in his parish, which was erected under his own superintendence ; it is one of the simplest buildings I think I ever saw. The decorations are very few, but what there are are exceedingly beautiful. I breakfasted this morning

with Mr. Tait, and in the course of conversation he showed, what I should never have suspected, that he is very much opposed to the Newmanites. Somebody happened to mention Froude's *Remains*, and quoted Mr. Oakeley's (a Fellow of this College) opinion that that book has done more good than any yet published. Mr. Tait said he partly agreed, but for a very different reason, for he thought the chief good it had done was in opening people's eyes, as Froude was the only person who had yet given his real opinions. I think he is right in the first part of his opinion, but I can hardly imagine, mistaken as they may be, that any of that party are liable to the charge of insincerity. At present they certainly comprehend not only the cleverest but by far the most religious part of Oxford, though this of course makes them much more dangerous. Mr. Scott, I fancy, leans towards them; and Mr. Ward, I know, goes the whole length with them, and is likely in a few years to become one of the most active and powerful among them.

The magnetism of the personality grew. In after-life Dr. Temple used to speak of Newman as the most telling reader of the Bible he had ever heard. "It was as though one 'in the Spirit' were meditating on a message from the other world."¹ Nor was it only the reading which impressed him:—

To his sister Katy

June 27, 1840.

. . . I shall bring down some of Newman's Sermons for you to look at. They are, I think, exceedingly good, and were written before he openly professed the very strong opinions he now holds; but of course it would be out of the question to suppose that you could agree with everything he says.

That which specially attracted him in the preacher was the insight and power of spiritual analysis—qualities which were reflected in Temple's own Rugby Sermons, and which drew from an old Rugbeian, on first hearing him, the remark, "I have heard nothing like that since Newman."

¹ "Earlier Years" Memoir, vol. i. p. 65.

There was in each something of the power of the Word of God to discern "the thoughts and intents of the heart." The mystical and poetical side of Newman had also a great charm for Temple. The hold on Temple of Ward was intellectual, of Pusey moral, and of Newman spiritual. But, as in the case of Dr. Pusey, he could not accept the whole of his teaching, and regretted his over-statements :—

To his Mother

November 23, 1840.

. . . Mr. Newman preached last Sunday afternoon, and I fancy did not much please his audience, for he put among the temptations of the world the temptation to argue from the evident adaptation of our faculties to worldly pursuits that it was intended that we should enter into such pursuits, and not make prayer and meditation and mortification the end of our lives. I cannot tell why he should never be content to push his arguments as far as they can consistently go; by going into such extremes he frightens people from listening to him at all. Anybody hearing that sermon would certainly imagine that he meant men to lock themselves up entirely and devote their lives to prayer; yet I am sure he would never mean that we are to do that.

Nor could he accept the whole system of Dr. Newman's followers. He was exercised by the perpetual insistence on the practice of fasting, and perplexed by the doctrinal teaching :—

To his Mother

March 14, 1840.

. . . The sermons at the University Church are incessantly on the subject of Fasting. I do not object to the preachers impressing their sense of the duties and means of Grace which are to be found in the Gospel, but I think this *continual* choice of such a subject is a strong mark of the spreading of the Pusey party, and I think that is much to be lamented. I was looking the other day in his (Pusey's) work on Baptism—a very celebrated book—and certainly at first it appeared as if he meant that being admitted into the Christian Covenant by Baptism, men fall from that Covenant by sin, but

that their repentance is accepted as an atonement and they are restored. I cannot say that is what he meant, but I think, to say the least, it is very strange that he did not see the necessity of using expressions not so liable to be misunderstood.

To his sister Netta

April 10, 1840.

. . . I wonder the Newmanites do not see the folly of carrying self-discipline so far as they do ; there is one of them I observed the other day, who, I know, has been using his utmost endeavour to fast all Lent, and now is quite ill and barely able to get through his duties. Pusey himself is much more moderate in his ideas.

To his Mother

April 4, 1840.

. . . The only thing that at present causes any excitement is a new book of Newman's, in which he has gone beyond all his former vagaries of enthusiastic superstition ; the book will, I am afraid, do very much mischief ; it is composed of Memoirs of the Early Fathers. With a great deal of real practical piety, there is not only a strong tendency to asceticism, but, what is far worse, an exalting of the Fathers to a level with the Scriptures ; in one place he goes so far as to call the Bible, unless coupled with tradition, "a jejune frame of words." Mr. Scott preached before the University last Sunday ; he has been always supposed to lean strongly to that party, but he plainly showed that he was by no means a supporter of such ultra opinions ; his sermon was principally on studying with a right end in view, and making a right use of the religious as well as the intellectual advantages afforded by such a University as this ; he touched on several other points, and I observed Pusey's countenance looked dissatisfied when he spoke of care being needed lest young men should think themselves religious because they zealously embraced the opinions of any party, and lest any should allow self-denial, whether mental or bodily, to degenerate from being an assistance to being a hindrance to the right performance of our duties. It was a beautiful sermon, and one feels (at least I always do) still more impressed, when one knows it is coming from the inmost heart.

He still loved best the simple ways in which he had been brought up :—

*To his Mother**April 10, 1840.*

. . . There is no evening Chapel here during Vacation times, so I went to New College this evening. The service is chanted, and all the Psalms sung to the organ. I cannot say that I liked it so well as the plain Service, though the music and singing were exquisitely beautiful. I like the Psalms to be sung to music well enough, but I think the Prayers are better without the chanting.

But with all his misgivings as to the teaching of this School on first acquaintance, it attracted him much to the study of the Early Fathers, although he could not always accept from it the conclusions which the Newmanites drew :—

*To his sister Katy**April 18, 1840.*

. . . I have been continuing to read S. Cyril's Lectures, and I like them extremely. I must confess though that I cannot anywhere find that distinct and definite idea which the Puseyites now have about tradition; on the contrary he says in one place to his audience, "Believe nothing that I tell you unless I show you that it is confirmed by Holy Scripture!" But I want very much to read the Early Fathers, those who knew the Apostles personally, Clemens, Polycarp, and Ignatius; and these people will not publish them, but go down to the fourth and fifth centuries. I wonder if they value the writings of those Fathers because they were most likely to know the early customs of the Church, that they do not above all prefer those who lived nearest to the Apostles' time.

He does not at all appreciate the modern German commentators :—

*To his sister Katy**December 2, 1839.*

. . . In reading the Greek Testament I have been obliged sometimes to refer to the works of these German Commentators, and certainly nothing can be more painful than their rationalistic views. In speaking of the miracle of the death of Ananias and Sapphira, one of them says that the couple were very susceptible, and became so terrified with what S.

Peter said that they fell into convulsions and died. Another goes still further and says that Peter was a man of very violent passions, and pulled out a knife and stabbed them one after another, but, as he was still alive when S. Luke wrote, it was not put in, lest it should subject him to a criminal prosecution, or at any rate prevent the spread of Christianity. And these theories, as they are by very clever men, they support with all the ingenuity that can be devised by man. I almost think professed infidels better than such believers.

He is much interested by his first introduction to the works of F. D. Maurice :—

To his sister Katy

February 1, 1840.

... There is a work on religion very much in that idealistic style which I saw the other day; it is called *The Kingdom of Christ*, and is written by a Clergyman of the name of Maurice. A very beautiful and apparently very pious work, but I fancy with a good deal of tendency towards what the dissenters call the inward Light. There was one idea which struck me very much; he says that the conscience is a supernatural gift, and asserts that the ancient Fathers would have thought it most dangerous heresy to consider it as natural to man, as that would suppose that anything good might be natural to us. He attacks Pusey, and I think misrepresents him, though I confess that I think many, if they read Pusey's work alone, would view it in the same light.

At times his thoughts are called away from controversy to the simple realities of life. These are the things which touch him most deeply :—

To his Mother

February 7, 1840.

I can hardly tell how much shocked I was yesterday at the sudden death of one of my College acquaintances; his name was Currer. He went down to the river in the afternoon with another man called Cave. Each took a skiff and they rowed down a couple of miles. A wherry was coming

down behind them and Currer leant upon his oars and watched its approach. The stream was very violent, and imperceptibly carried him towards a lasher or waterfall of some height. The instant he saw it he attempted to return, and seemed to have no fear, for he was a beautiful rower; but the stream was too strong, his boat was carried with irresistible force down the lasher. An iron bar crosses the lasher a little way from the top; his boat was dashed to pieces against this bar, but he managed to seize it with his hands. He held on dangling for some minutes whilst his companion, who had rushed to his assistance, attempted to hold him up with an oar; but at last as the stream was swaying his body to and fro his head struck against the bar and he immediately dropped. Cave jumped in after him, but the stream was so violent that he barely escaped with life himself. Currer, meanwhile, was washed away down the stream and was picked out by a man of University College. Everything was done for him; in less than a quarter of an hour an Oxford physician was at the spot, but he had been in the water forty minutes, and a quarter of an hour is quite enough to ensure death. It has spread a great gloom over Balliol; I do not know a person who does not regret him. He was clever and good; without a question there was not his equal in the College for real religious feeling. He had not the slightest ostentation and was never heard to say a word against any one. Mr. Tait went to the place the instant he heard of the occurrence, and was there till late last night. This morning in reading the service he was very much affected, and when he came to the prayer in the Litany for deliverance from sudden death, he was quite overcome and paused for more than a minute before he could go on, and at last he almost screamed it out in agony. The Master has been crying like a child, and everything seems to recall it to his mind. Mr. Scott left us yesterday morning to see the vacant living; he will be miserable enough when he hears of it, for Currer was his pupil and he was very fond of him as you may well imagine. . . . It makes me tremble when I think of the awful truth which is so strikingly exemplified in this instance: "In the midst of life we are in death." I feel as if my mind were paralysed by having it brought so close before me and I can hardly think of anything else. The last words poor Currer said were: "Do not jump in after me, for the stream is too strong for you." This was while he was clinging to the bar.

February 10.

All the town have been making grand preparations for the illumination which is to take place in honour of the Queen's marriage. Our Fellows did not wish to join, as they thought it would be indecorous, but the Vice-Chancellor has requested that we should, because he thinks it would be impossible to explain the reason to the mob; so we are to have candles in all the windows, but no stars or crowns like the other Colleges. There are to be a dozen candles in my room, six in each window. The season of rejoicing is most inopportune for us; there is not a person, I should think, in the College who does not feel too much saddened by the awful events of last week to feel much pleasure in the idea of rejoicing. Mr. Tait mentioned the subject yesterday in his evening lecture. When he began to speak about this, his own voice was so choked with tears that he could hardly go on. The Master sobbed piteously, and the tears ran down the poor old man's cheeks as if Currer had been his own brother. There is a melancholy pleasure in observing the sympathy which all feel for his fate. It makes one feel more as if one belongs to a family and shared the common grief of all for some relation of it, than as if it were a College composed of members without any tie but that of being near each other to draw them together.

February 11.

Currer is to be buried to-morrow in the Parish Churchyard; all the College are requested to attend the funeral procession, and six of his most intimate friends are selected as the Pall-bearers. Of course I shall be there with the rest; and it will be the first funeral I have ever attended.

But even here the spirit of controversy comes in:—

To his Mother

May 30, 1840.

. . . I have just seen the model of the monument that is to be put up in our Chapel to the memory of the poor fellow who was drowned last Term; it is exceedingly beautiful. Two cousins of his, by name Palmer, were desired to write an inscription for it, but the Master does not like it now it is done, and I fancy will reject it. It is in beautiful Latin and is made up of sentences taken from the Psalms, but in it are some words which at any other time, I think,

would have passed without notice ; but just now, when people are watching everything to see if it has any tendency to Popery, are supposed from the known bias of the Palmers to Newmanism to be written so as to approach as nearly as they possibly can to a prayer for the dead. Among them are the words, "Let not the deep swallow thee up," and indeed the Latin does not even approach so nearly to a prayer as that does, but rather expresses a hope. For myself I certainly cannot see the harm of it, and I think that it is that very over-cautious spirit which does so much mischief, for people get disgusted with it and run into the opposite extreme. Another objection the Master has is that the Latin, though very good, is in the quaint simple style of the Vulgate and therefore looks Popish ; I think this of still less weight than the former.

The controversial spirit spreads, and for the time engrosses all attention. Everything is used as material for the flame :—

To his sister Katy

March 5, 1840.

. . . The Church outside my window is to be still further decorated ; they have, I believe, £6000 left and intend to put up a monument to Cranmer, Latimer, Ridley, and Wickliffe. The Newmanites dislike it very much, and complain loudly that this money is to be wasted on decorations, whereas it would be enough to build and endow a new Church. This may be true, but they cannot conceal that their reason for disliking the undertaking is not that the money is not spent upon a new Church—for they would gladly put up a monument to S. Augustine—but that they have a great dislike to our Reformers. For my own part I think their dislike unfair, for they seem to blame these men because they were not perfect and free from error the instant they left the Romish Church. They were evidently carried by their abhorrence of what was bad in Popery to the opposite extreme ; there is a very striking passage in Luther which shows this most strongly ; he calls the Epistle of S. James "an epistle of straw." He was evidently so impressed with the badness of the doctrine which made our salvation depend on works that he went into the opposite extreme of rejecting everything which even enforced works as a part of faith. However that may be, these Newmanites catch at the failings of men who were half

in the dark and then depreciate all their other doings. Our Master is, I believe, a zealous promoter of the intended monument.

To his sister Netta

January 25, 1841.

. . . The plan of the Martyrs' Memorial that is to be put up here in Oxford has been published ; it will be very beautiful, but I fear they have chosen a very inauspicious season for it ; one is apt to reverence the Reformers rather as the means of our religious liberty than as individuals, and hence it comes that they are so generally admired ; for my own part I find that the more I read their history and still more their own letters, the worse impression I have of their characters ; so that I am sorry this should have been done, as it has caused their lives to be so much investigated, and I should fear an attack upon them would to many minds tend to weaken the authority of the Church.

His own pet Debating Society is in danger of being drawn in :—

To his Mother

January 30, 1841.

. . . It is our Decad night and I know very little about the question we are to discuss, the merits of Niehbuhr's *History of Rome*, and it is so very learned a book that to attack or defend it would require either great reading or great impudence ; so I must get up a little of both. I fancy we are rather looked on with suspicion by some of the Big-wigs. I know Newman, hearing the Decad mentioned the other day, said, " Ah ! that is a Balliol Society in which they discuss whether Saint Charles was a Martyr or not." It certainly is recorded in our minutes that a vote was passed by a majority of one approving of the death of Charles the First ; now opinion runs pretty strongly in another direction.

Sewell comes in, adding his own quota to the controversy from a collateral side ; Tait preaches from the opposite point of view, and Hawkins of Oriel intervenes as a moderating influence :—

*To his Mother**March 21, 1840.*

. . . I went on Wednesday to a Lecture on Moral Philosophy by Sewell, the Professor. It is the most extra-high Tory and high Church view that I ever heard of which he gives us. . . . He argues that the Government neither can nor ought to educate except with the Church. So far I agree with him, but then he went on to assert the Church's authority to ordain rules and teach doctrines without any one's having the right to examine into the Bible and see whether or not those doctrines are there; now I think, on the contrary, that private judgment is not only a right but a duty. I shall, I think, however, hear him out, and see what he has to urge for his opinions.

*To his Mother**Undated.*

. . . Mr. Tait preached last Monday before the University; his sermon was beautifully written, and as a piece of argument complete as far as it went; but I cannot say I liked it, for its tendency was that it was a very good thing to be in the Church if you happened so to be, but that it is not much difference. I think Mr. Scott's plan of opposing the Newmanites much better than such ultra views. . . .

*To his Mother**October 24, 1840.*

. . . We had a very strong sermon last Sunday, and generally speaking a very good one, I think, against the Newmanites; it was by Mr. Hawkins, the head of Oriel College. Newman spoke very highly of his last Bampton Lectures in a notice in *the British Critic*; and I think Hawkins was afraid he would be identified with that party, and therefore took this opportunity to declare his opinions. His sermon consisted in tracing—even in the very earliest of the Fathers, even those who were acquainted with the Apostles—a disposition to exalt too highly the human instruments used by the Almighty for spreading the Gospel; it arose from the nature of the times, as there was then so strong a tendency to depreciate those instruments; but Mr. Hawkins observed that the same tendency existed even in the Apostles' times, and yet they never show that disposition. I think he pressed the point a good deal too far, but, on the

whole, it was an excellent sermon and will do a great deal of good, I should hope.

With all these voices making themselves heard the atmosphere was doubtless stimulating, but the position bewildering. He begins to be affected by the sense of great irregularities in the discipline of the Church :—

To his Mother

May 23, 1840.

. . . We had a sermon last Sunday which had caused some sensation in the University and not, I think, without reason ; it consisted of an analysis of the instances in which the Church Canons and Church Rubric are not observed by those who have sworn to the observance of them, namely, the Clergy. The list is certainly most fearful ; to my mind it fully accounts for all the dissent, infidelity, Puseyitism, and so forth now so prevalent. We must pray that God will help us to a better condition.

And he is also distressed by the want of self-sacrifice in the ordinary life of Churchmen :—

To Katy

November 11, 1840.

. . . This “walking by sight and not by faith” is exemplified, I think, in the way people have nowadays of refusing to give anything to the commencement of a thing which they are not likely to see the end of. The Bishop of Calcutta wishes to commence a Cathedral in his Diocese, and desires to lay out what he has in building the Choir or upper part, leaving the rest to be added afterwards, as it would be quite impossible (or at least it appears so) to get enough at once to finish the whole, but now people say they will withdraw their contributions unless it is a complete building, and so I believe they will only have a large Parish Church. The times are changed certainly ; there are but two Cathedrals in England that were finished at once, S. Paul’s and Christ Church here, and the rest rose up slowly in succeeding generations.

*To his Mother**February 8, 1841.*

The Papists are certainly beating us in this respect (self-sacrifice). Lady Stourton has just gone out as a Sister of Mercy to Botany Bay to assist to teach the convicts. Miss Agnew is constantly in the worst parts of Bermondsey attending upon the poor; and all this is done so quietly that the former case is hardly known anywhere and the latter very little; it is done, too, under the direction of their Priest, who is surely the proper person to do such things. If we do such things we make such a fuss and get up Societies and publish reports, and have gossiping tea-meetings (they go to Church instead of that), and cannot do anything in submission but cry out about being dictated to and domineered over. They put us to shame, and the only comfort is when one thinks that things would not be so if people acted up to the doctrines of the Church. The great want in our present state of things, in my opinion, is some means of carrying off the superabundant enthusiasm of the country; people with strong, ardent feelings cannot sit down to the quiet duties of their station; and the result is that such men are becoming Newmanites, Wesleyans, Papists, etc., and a very large proportion of such feeling evaporates in religious conversation; it would be a higher attainment, I should suppose, to devote all this warmth of heart to the everyday duties of life, but this we cannot persuade people to do, and surely all this enthusiasm might, if properly directed, have converted half the heathen world by this time, besides the necessity of our having a Poor Law and other mischievous things within the country.

There are many things in the Newmanite Party which try him—especially their mannerisms, but he condones much because of the spiritual force of their leader and the higher standard of life at which the movement aims:—

*To his Mother**May 31, 1841.*

. . . Mr. Newman must be a very wonderful man to have such immense power over all that come into contact with him. You may see this most strikingly in the way that all his acquaintance imitate his manner and peculiarities; it

looks like affectation certainly, but I confess I believe them to be above that. I think the reason is that in their minds his manner is so connected with every good feeling that mere association leads them to imitate him, and many I think do it unconsciously. It is, however, very absurd to see them all hold their heads slightly on one side, all speak in very soft voices, all speak quick and make long pauses between their sentences, and all on reaching their seats fall on their knees exactly as if their legs were knocked from under them. He preached on Christian wisdom, pointing out how essential it is that it must follow, not precede, faith; showing how the opposite position led directly and almost invariably to Socinianism.

To his Mother

January 30, 1841.

. . . It has become quite the fashion amongst the Newmanites of late to speak in rapturous admiration of Wesley; one never knows what crotchets these people will run into, but I do believe many of the lower class of Newmanites are fast going towards Popery, and I always thought Methodism very near akin to it.

He had already sought relief from speculation in practical religious duties, such as Sunday school work,¹ and he now seeks relief in the study of the Prayer Book:—

To his Mother

January 30, 1841.

. . . I am beginning to study the history of the Prayer Book this term; I like the kind of study very much, and it gives me more acquaintance with the Early Fathers than I can get in any other form. It is very remarkable, and at the same time I think an elevating thought, to know that the same prayers to a great extent, and nearly, too, in the same order, have been used ever since the Church began; but people's minds are not the same as when they considered themselves not to have attended Divine Service unless they had been present at the Communion.

His birthday letter (November 30, 1840) reveals the things which are still nearest to his heart:—

¹ "Earlier Years" Memoir, vol. i. p. 55.

To his Mother

November 30, 1840.

. . . You cannot think how much older I feel to-day; I think the weather must have a bad effect upon me. I feel gloomy and uncomfortable at the thought of being so much older; I see almost every one around me feeling less and less sympathy with their fellow-men as they grow older; and I dread the same hardness stealing over myself. It was our Communion Sunday yesterday, and I could not help thinking over how everything in my life had been arranged as if to force me to be everything good, and how little I had benefited compared to what I might have done; and though the thought at that time rather tended to compose than depress me, yet now the gloomy side has been haunting me ever since. I do not know any comfort for anything equal to the ordinances of the Church; since I wrote the above I have been to Chapel, and I feel in good spirits now, though rather cheerful than merry. I am longing for the time when I shall see you again, my own mamma; there is no place like Axon for comfort of mind, at least none that I know.

In the spring of 1841 the stir about Tract XC. begins, and he determines not to take a side:—¹

To his Mother

BALLIOL, March 15, 1841.

The disturbance about the Tract still continues, and I confess makes me feel very anxious, absurd as it may sound. The Heads of Houses met the other day, and finding no one of their body knew anything of the Tract, separated to read it; but first voted a censure on Mr. Tait and the other three who had signed the Protest for not bringing it before them in the first instance, instead of referring it in this way to public opinion. Yesterday they met again and passed a very severe censure on the Tract itself, condemning the authors of it as acting contrary to the Statutes. Newman will submit, I have no doubt, and withdraw the Tract, but the business will be very serious indeed if the matter is brought before University Convocation or before the Bishops; in the first case a schism in the Church would be almost inevitable, as there would be numbers coming up from the

¹ "Earlier Years" Memoir, vol. i. p. 52.

country to vote, who either believed Newman held correspondence with the Pope or else worshipped him. If it came before the Bishops I fear the result would be that Newman and his friends would leave the Church, and the reaction would be tremendous. I would not even express an opinion on the merits of the case; if you trust one party the Tract is a piece of the most complete Jesuitical juggling, if the other nothing can be more fair.

It was not likely that the study of dogmatics would be as helpful to him in this crisis as the study of works of devotion; at the beginning of the next term he writes:—

To his Mother

BALLIOL., May 4, 1841.

. . . I am going to begin studying the Articles this term, though not without some reluctance; the questions that arise are so deep and difficult that I do not know a more dangerous study. What a difficult question that is between the Papists and ourselves—"Whether, by God's grace assisting, man can perform a single perfectly good and holy action." Those I am going to read this term are those from the 9th to the 18th inclusive, being that division which concerns men as individuals and treats of their acceptance with God.

Later on he says:—

To his Mother

February 9, 1842.

. . . I shall try to find Blunt's book on the Articles, since Katy likes it, and read it; I never found any difficulty with the Articles merely in a doctrinal point of view as guides for our belief, but as controversial Articles they are very badly worded. Why, for instance, should we lay so much stress on the Formula of Justification by *faith only* when those words are to be found only in one place in the Bible, and there it is declared that we are *not* justified by faith only? And for the thirteenth Article—when it is pressed to verbal accuracy we shall have to put Socrates dying a martyr to high religious principle on a level with Nero; for the article cannot be confined to Christians, as the grace of God has been given to them *all*, but I will see what Blunt says.

It is evident that there was that in his letters home at this time which occasioned comment and not a little anxiety :—

To Katy

March 8, 1841.

. . . I have another book here which I have a great mind to send you down, but I am afraid of shocking your consciences, as it is a Papistical work ; it is very beautiful, and whatever errors there are, and of course there are plenty, they come out plainly and are easily seen ; it is a little book, and if you like to have it I will enclose it in my next letter. I am reading now to get up the subject of monasteries ; I have put off my motion till this day week, and by that time I hope to make myself acquainted with their general character. Hume is the only writer I can find who blames the English Monasteries at the Reformation ; and Fox I have not yet examined, but I think he does also. There remain still in the Bodleian testimonials to the character of some hundreds of those institutions signed by Henry's commissioners, and lauding them to the skies. And then how just it was after these monks had been turned out upon the world not to repeal the law which made it illegal for them to inherit property, but, if any was left to them, gave it to the foundation to which it belonged ! No ; instead of repealing the law the poor wretches were made mendicants, and if any money came by inheritance to any one of them it went to the courtiers who had seized the lands.

But there is a place left in his mind for the more spiritual things of religion :—

To his Mother

BALLIOL, May 4, 1841.

. . . Our senior Fellow is very ill, and not expected to live ; I do not know him myself the least, but those who do speak of him as a most excellent person, and show how much they value him by the anxiety they evidently feel on his account. . . . He is prayed for in the Chapel every day, morning and evening ; I do not know anything which tends more to bind the members of a Society together than uniting in such prayers for one of themselves ; there is a sort of feeling produced that you are one of a family ; that if you are afflicted you are not in the midst of those that feel no

sympathy for your sorrow. I am sure I do not wonder that those who have no other ties should love Oxford better than any other place.

And his reliance on the surer foundation keeps him steady in the midst of strife :—

To his Mother

May 20, 1841.

. . . The controversy here seems almost to have revived again. . . . I see nothing as yet but doubt and perplexity, but whatever the science of religion may be, the duties are quite plain, generally speaking.

Ultimately the battle of the Tract concentrated on Ward. The first blow levelled at him is the deprivation of his mathematical lectureship. Personally Temple must have regretted the attack on his friend ; but he owns that from the Master's point of view he could not have acted otherwise under the conditions of those days.

In the autumn of 1841 two new figures appear upon the scene, one, an ecclesiastical hero after Temple's own heart. The divergence of Temple and Selwyn in respect of theological opinion was marked, but they were men of the same type and mutually respected each other. When Bishop Selwyn died, there is a characteristic allusion made to him in one of Bishop Temple's private letters as "the most disinterested man in regard to money matters that I ever knew." It was the same disinterestedness in a different form which struck the undergraduate.¹

The other figure was Dr. Arnold, who came up to Oxford at this time to lecture as Professor of Modern History.² He too had much in him in which Temple shared, although at the time of the first meeting there were more affinities between

¹ "Earlier Years" Memoir, vol. i. p. 55.

² *Ibid.* vol. i. p. 64.

Temple and the great Missionary Bishop. As years went by the relations were doubtless reversed, and yet it would be hard to say which burnt longest and latest in Temple's breast, the zeal for the missionary cause or the zeal of the Christian teacher.

To his Mother

February 9, 1842.

. . . Dr. Arnold has been lecturing here lately, as Regius Professor of Modern History. His opinions rather clash with most here, but there is something very manly about him. I sometimes wish he were not a Whig.

The limit of the influence which Newman and his school exercised upon Temple's mind had not yet been reached, and for the time the teaching of Arnold was disregarded; but unconsciously Temple received into himself the germ of a new spirit in the coming of Arnold. Something of a like kind had already been experienced in the teaching of Tait, and in the atmosphere of Balliol; but Arnold added to the influence the power of a great personality. The casual coming together of the two men marked an epoch in Temple's career, and with the entrance of Arnold upon the scene these references to Temple's undergraduate days may fittingly close. There was much around him to unsettle, but he was not left in any state of doubt as to fundamentals of the faith. He spent Holy Week on the eve of his final examination at Oxford; and found rest, as throughout his life, in central truths.¹

Dr. Arnold died on June 12, 1842, and Temple was not yet settled into his place as tutor at Balliol before there came from Tait, the newly elected headmaster, the offer of an assistant mastership at

¹ "Earlier Years" Memoir, vol. i. p. 54.

Rugby. The correspondence between himself and his mother on the subject is exceedingly interesting, not only as showing Temple's first impressions in regard to the school over which he was afterwards to preside, and his own relations at the time to the Oxford movement, but as giving an insight into his mother's character—a combination of religious common sense, amounting almost to genius, and of sensitive truthfulness, which reveals from whom her son inherited that quality.

To his Mother

DOLGELLY, August 9, 1842.

. . . Tait has been extremely kind, and he writes with his heart so much set upon the plan that gratitude would incline me to do my best for him, if there were no other consideration. At the same time there are serious considerations on the other hand; when I first came to Oxford I came with a strong feeling against Puseyism, and naturally was thrown very much into the society of Tait and those men who oppose Pusey most strongly. At the same time I felt somehow that what I now saw and heard was not what I had been taught from childhood; that though the Doctrines were nominally the same, yet they were understood in a very different sense; and I began at last to discover that while I thought myself inclined to the one party, and did really think I was believing the so-called evangelical doctrine, I had been acting upon the other; that, in fact, I had thought I was believing one thing when I was really believing another. I began to find that the principle of obedience, which you know was made the keystone of our education, was professed by Pusey and his friends and was acted upon, but was really, though of course not nominally, rejected by the others. You must have seen that I was changing, but I do really think that it was merely my head that was changing and not my heart, and that what appeared inconsistent was really the truest consistency. My mind is now, I believe, made up as to the *line* of doctrines I should accept, though I should not pretend to say that it is on the particular points. And now I am thinking of going to Rugby, the place of all others from which the most violent opposition to such doctrines has proceeded; and I confess I do feel a fear lest the shock of so

sudden a change of society should make me very uncomfortable, to say the least; for undoubtedly for the next two years I shall have to adopt the most impenetrable reserve—a habit which I have begun to learn already, but which I am always afraid of carrying too far, as it is but a short step from thence to insincerity and moral cowardice. I feel as if I were proposing to walk by the edge of a dangerous precipice and over very unpleasant ground at the same time. . . . Yet I believe I am doing right in accepting Tait's offer. I have thought of both sides, and I confess I had rather not, if I could avoid it, remain in Oxford during the next year, and I hope, too, I may learn something towards the management of a Tutorship at Balliol under the guidance of so practised a hand as Tait. I must pray to be preserved amidst the temptations, and you will pray for me too, dearest mamma. The whole project may end in nothing, after all, and if so I shall feel that it was better for me not to go.

From his Mother

AXON, August 12, 1842.

When I read the first part of your letter this morning I was pleased and thankful for the kindness which had been shown you, because it is so very honourable to you, and sufficiently lucrative, without giving you such very hard work as you have now; but as I read on my feelings changed to an undefined sense of something wrong about it, which made me so nervous that I could not clearly see what distressed me until I read Netta's bit, and then it was as clear as the day. It seems to me hardly possible that Mr. Tait should be unacquainted with your present opinions, and if he is not so, there can be no objection to your accepting a situation under him—with the leave of the Master of Balliol—and then there can be no necessity for keeping up a painful reserve. But if Mr. Tait still imagines that you still retain the same opinions as those you held when you first went to Oxford, it is clearly your duty to undeceive him at once, without waiting to know whether he wants you or not, for you cannot honourably enter his house holding opinions different from him without acquainting him that you do so. The more I reflect upon it the more I think you have been led by your feelings more than you ought; you naturally feel very grateful to Mr. Tait and think you ought to do what he wishes, and on that account are ready to sacrifice your comfort by living in an unnatural state of reserve. But

to do so seems to me to be professing High Church and acting Low—taking feeling and not principle for your guide. It is one of those cases in which there seems to be no middle way between right and wrong. You must be open with Mr. Tait, and leave it to him to accept you or not, for you will be placed in a very different situation at Rugby to what you have been. You must be considered to have formed your opinions, or you would not be fit to instruct others; still, were it only a matter of feeling, a change might take place without affecting your character as you get older, but principles are the same for boys and men. Is Mr. Jelf likely to approve of your going to Rugby? I suppose Mr. Scott would like it. I should be very sorry for you to have to live with people from whom you differ in opinion without being fully at liberty to express your own; but this restraint might be good for you, and wisely and mercifully ordered to keep you in the *middle way*, but with Mr. Tait no such reserve is necessary. If he accepts you, he can only require you not to bring forward different opinions unnecessarily. It is a sore temptation and your first real trial—a situation is offered you which thousands would be too happy in accepting, but oh, my beloved Freddy, do not let your first step be marked by an insincerity that would, in my mind, throw a shade over your fair character and bright name—do not let any plausible reasoning in your own mind persuade you that you can either accept or decline Mr. Tait's offer without opening your whole mind to him.

To his Mother

August 16, 1842.

Thank you for your nice letter, which I quite agreed with, mamma; you know I always do. But I think you must have misunderstood me if you thought I meant that any reserve would be necessary between myself and *Tait*, who knows already pretty well that I by no means agree with him in many most important points; indeed, as far as *acting* is concerned, nothing would make me, I trust, act deliberately contrary to my opinions or even, which is in effect the same, not act upon them, in the face of anybody at Rugby; but I meant that living as I should be, very much in the company of the other masters, I should certainly never be permitted to rest were I openly to profess my opinions to them; at the same time I can hardly imagine a case where it would become my duty in the presence of men so much older than myself,

and all of them Clergymen, to express a dissent from what they taught. The case stands thus: I go there as a subordinate of Tait's, Tait well knowing my present opinions; it is therefore his fault, not mine, if he, notwithstanding that knowledge, places me in a situation in which we cannot act together, and from what I know of him I should think he would take very good care not to do that. Still, it must be a great discomfort to me not to be able to converse freely with those with whom I should be associated, or if I did, to be liable to eternal debates; this discomfort I am willing to bear if I could be of use to Tait, but if at any time I have to act, I trust I shall not be afraid. I do not know how the least suspicion of insincerity can attach to this; it seems to me, when Tait knows how I think, the matter rests with himself, not with me. That Tait knows it I am quite certain. . . . Tait . . . does thoroughly appreciate conscientious conduct, however mistaken, and though he is, of course, a little more ready in perceiving it in one who agrees with him than in one who differs, I do not think he is ever wilfully unfair, and he could not, I am sure, live with a conscientious man without acknowledging him to be such. . . . From what I have seen of the other masters' writings I should think them inclined to be much more stern; indeed, a long residence in the country amongst men who all hold the same opinions as essentially true must tend to make men think that all who believe otherwise cannot be good men, or if they are, must be simpletons: with such men I could not profess my opinions freely, for I cannot talk freely when my opinions are considered *ipso facto* a complete condemnation of myself, from which there is no appeal; to charitable men of whatever kind I could talk freely where there was fair opportunity, but if people are intolerant, which is the modern word people seem to understand better than uncharitable, I cannot open my lips in comfort: I do not believe I was ever framed for argument. Do you think, under this view of the case, I can fairly be charged with insincerity if, when Tait knows how I disagree with him, I should still accept his offer? I confess I do not, but if you do I will certainly write and refuse it immediately.

To his Mother

DOLGELLY, September 15, 1842.

I have had a message from the Master telling me he will require my services as soon as circumstances will permit him

to avail himself of them; I have written to Tait to decline the Mastership at Rugby, as the Master distinctly wishes me to be in Oxford and in residence.

It is obvious from these letters that his four years at the University had had their effect on the evangelical training of his early years; moreover, that his standpoint was not Tait's, and that Tait was aware of the fact. This is the period at which the influence of the Oxford Movement upon him reached high-water mark.

He is, however, determined to be fair all round:—

To his Mother

BALLIOL, May 1, 1843.

. . . I have been reading lately Paget's *Warden of Bark-inghamholt*. I cannot imagine what induces people to write such books. I cannot believe any good can be done by spiteful exposure of the bad parts of the Evangelical views, least of all by exposing them to ridicule. It always seems to me like a confession of weakness when a man descends to that. But at the same time I confess I am tired of the aggressive Theology altogether, and I should not be sorry if it were laid aside for ten years or so till men were calmed. I was inclined to be very angry with — on Good Friday; he preached before the University on the subject of Justification. He gave exactly—though certainly without knowing it—the doctrine of the Roman Church as declared by the Council of Trent; but at the same time he thought it could not be safe to let slip an opportunity of attacking the Roman Catholics; so he gave another view as being theirs, and proceeded to abuse them for maintaining it with the regular formulæ “gratification of human pride,” “arrogant assumption of merit,” etc. Now, really, it does not seem to me right to attack people without being certain what they maintain; at any rate not to attribute to them an opinion which you have no ground but hearsay to believe to be theirs. That the view he gave as his own and as that of our Church is really the Roman, I am quite certain. This timidity which makes people so afraid of finding the slightest agreement between themselves and the Roman Catholics is to my mind by no means creditable.

The kind of impression which Temple made at this period upon those who knew him—the combination of high ability with simple modesty, and the touch of what almost amounted to saintliness—was so unusual and striking as to call forth the following letter (the precise year is not known) :—

Extract from a letter from Mr. Jelf to Mrs. Temple

CHRIST CHURCH, *January 29.*

. . . I take the liberty of enclosing to you a sermon of my brother's which, as the subject is at present much talked about, and is in itself of immense interest, I think you may like to see. At any rate it will show you that I have not forgotten my kind friends at Axon. Freddy is working away very hard ; he had a cold about two days ago but is now well again. I cannot help putting a small pencil-mark opposite a passage of the sermon on page thirty-eight, as I think you will like to know that my brother confessed to me that when he wrote those words he had Freddy in his eye. This I write for your own private eyes, as there is no one so good but that praise may spoil him, and if I thought it would reach him I should have kept it to myself.

The question raised by the Oxford controversy had inevitably led to the further question, the basis of religious belief—Is faith to rest on external authority or on the voice of conscience ?

To his Mother

BALLIOL, *February 12, 1843.*

There are two courses : to obey the Church as if she had final authority, as if in short she were infallible or nearly so ; or carefully to cultivate all those principles in which under her guidance I have been trained, affectionately embracing her commands, but at the same time never pretending to profess on her authority what I did not believe, nay, even leaving her if I felt her commands irreconcilable with conscience. I only ask what you think, mamma, but I do not mean I intend implicitly to follow you. Obedience, obedience, obedience—I could go through the world chanting that one word ; but the question arises, to what ? to the voice of an

internal monitor or an external guide? and if the latter, why? . . . I do not show very much, I believe, how these things weigh upon me: I still laugh and talk just as you have often seen me, and I felt it as much during the Christmas vacation as I have at any time. The many questions that are pressed upon one, justification, repentance, Church membership, Transubstantiation, and the differences between all who speak of them. — and — think the question of justification a verbal one; it seems to me most vital. — declares he would oppose the Ordination of one who held Transubstantiation; — can see no difference on that point between ourselves and the Romanists. And all seem so positive; and it does give one pain to hurt the feelings of one's friends, and yet what is to be done? I cannot be a chameleon and change with my society, though I feel often very doubtful whether I am right in that as it is, whether I do not yield too much to the dread of hurting the feelings of others.

His mother, with keen perception, gave him the right kind of answer to his letters—"advice" rather than "instruction,"¹ but it was a "hard saying" for him.

A few days later he pours out his whole mind in a letter, touching in its simple beauty and striking for its insight into spiritual truth. We note in the midst of his mental trouble the gradual process by which he arrived at the ultimate conclusion on which in after years he rested. It is expressed in his own essay on "The Education of the World." We begin by accepting spiritual truth in deference to authority, whether of the Bible, or Church, or parents; the final acceptance or rejection must depend upon the verdict of the trained and exercised conscience:—

To his Mother

BALLIOL, February 21.

I am very sorry that my letters should have given you so much the appearance of an overwrought mind. My friends here, I fancy, would laugh not a little at such an idea.

¹ "Earlier Years" Memoir, vol. i. p. 69.

But the fact was that I was then in a good deal of excitement, and was writing in a hurry that I might finish by sermon time. I am far from being mentally injured by my work, except perhaps inasmuch as I am able to read very little for myself. And if I had less to do in one way I should only do the more in another. I am afraid as to next term I am already pledged to the College in a manner that I should not be justified in not fulfilling, especially as I am perfectly well and cannot certainly find in myself any symptoms of mental overstraining. What seems so dark to you should rather be attributed to my own perplexity, which would not be less in any case. Indeed, in the vacation it has often been so great that I have been obliged to leave the room in order to prevent myself from saying more than I wished.

You ask my confidence, dearest mamma; and you are perhaps surprised at my never before having spoken openly. I am afraid you will not be pleased with the reason, and I do not defend it; but I believe I ought to tell you. The reason then was that I never felt sure you had confidence in me; I felt sure myself that I was striving to find the right road; this was my aim, whatever faults I committed in the struggle. But I did not feel sure you would understand me. I thought you would take perplexity for leaning on myself, and earnest conviction for pride. I was not acting right in that, and it was very cowardly. But do now believe that I am not led astray by my own fancies intentionally, and that I am trying to guard against them. I have been reading your letters, and I think you agree with me more than you imagine, but that you too—forgive me for saying so—have been frightened by the consequences. You say that obedience is due to the Bible as the Word of God; true, but how do we know that it is the Word of God? You believe it is, but have you ever carefully examined the arguments for and against? Do you trust to History? No, for you have not read history on the point. The Authority, then? What authority? The Church? and why the Church? and so on; going backward you can never get an answer. Shall I tell you why you believe the Bible?—because it agrees with your conscience. . . . You were told that the Bible contained the Word of God. You believed it and acted upon that belief, and up to this day you have never found yourself misled by following its directions. It has always agreed with what you cannot but acknowledge is the voice of God within you,

your conscience; and now you believe firmly what as a child you took on trust. And so completely has this been the course you have taken, that you have never thought it necessary to *study* the arguments for or against Romanism or Dissent; you have acted upon what you were told, and you have found yourself not misled. And now if this be the course for you, why not for a Dissenter? Why should not he too act upon the principles he has been taught, till he finds they do not agree with the Word of God in his heart? Why is it incumbent on him to study evidences and overwhelm himself with learning while the Churchman is to be content with practical proof? He too takes on trust what he has been told; he too will, if he be conscientious, carry it out to the utmost, and surely till he finds it disagrees with the silent witness within him he cannot reject it. Not that it is not a subject of consideration to him to see so many Christians differing from himself, but still that will only make him more doubtful of himself, will make him try his opinions so much the more by the *only* way in which opinion can be tried, by practising them, or at least applying them to practice, and will make him more than ever attentive to his Bible, which he has already convinced himself is the Word of God. This is what I meant by calling on the Dissenter to follow out his own principles, yet warning him he would find them false; it is the process you yourself have followed and why not he? . . .

This, then, is the path I would mark out for myself as well as others, taking the commands of the Church to obey them and practise them, till either they are more and more deeply rooted in my mind or better things appear; nor can I understand what is meant by "quenching the Spirit," except it be the attempt to force your conscience to believe what it does not, and to disobey itself. And one comfort I have in this belief, which has always accompanied it—that the more I try to carry out what I have been taught, the more I am convinced of the truth of the Bible. Other views I have altered; justification by faith, in the sense of the words in which it is used commonly, I have given up; the necessity of conversion I have given up; the merely typical nature of the Sacraments, I have given up; but a belief in the Bible as God's Word comes more and more home to me every day. There are two things more I have to remark before I tell you what I think upon your letters; the first is that it is almost impossible to

estimate the power of religion in forming even the most unscriptural doctrines into vehicles of religious truth; in consideration of our weakness this has been granted us, that often we profess with our lips and understandings what we do not believe in our hearts, and many a Dissenter is a Churchman in spirit. There is an invisible unity between all religious men; the same truths actuate them all, and many a man, who by circumstances has been led to express his belief in a form different from that which the Church has described, has nevertheless the same belief though he knows it not. And secondly, if this be so, how much ought we to cultivate that charity "which hopeth all things"; and while we profess that we do hold our belief, not as mere opinion but as truth, confess nevertheless that we are fallible and that perhaps those who differ most from us in appearance agree most in reality. Let us judge things from within not from without; do not accuse the Dissenter of insubordination till we have considered whether had we been so brought up we should have looked upon submission to the Church in a different way from what we now feel towards the submission to the Pope; do not blame the Romanist for idolatry till we have considered whether, had we been so taught, that would have been greater idolatry in us than it is now to pull off one's hat on going into Church, or to sign an infant with the sign of the Cross. . . . Still there is much left dark. But your letters, dearest mamma, do me much good, and especially the last. Oh, do not let us slacken, do not let us, because our eyes are opened, think we see all! Let us remember that once we doubted of what we now believe, and perhaps time will show us that the Bible contains doctrines we never dreamt of.¹

In the line of thought running through these letters the influence of Coleridge is perceptible. "He who begins by loving Christianity better than Truth will proceed by loving his own Sect or Church better than Christianity, and end in loving himself better than all."²

Years later Dr. Temple summed up the Newman episode by saying: "Newman's initial mistake was

¹ See "Earlier Years" Memoir, vol. i. p. 69.

² Aphorism xxv., second edition of *Aids to Reflection*, p. 96.

that he began by searching for the true Church rather than for the truth—he inverted the right order.”

The next series of letters deals specially with another subject which, equally with the supremacy of conscience, always claimed his allegiance, viz. the connexion between faith and life. The real acceptance of doctrine was tested by the life, and the worldliness and unspirituality of many members of the Church was in consequence a perpetual grief to him :—

To his Mother

March 13, 1842 (? 3).

. . . One thing which perplexes me much I find on every side: there is throughout our Church such a dreadful worldliness, such as I do not believe can be paralleled in any other; the idea of our living for another world is lost sight of, and Christianity seems to be regarded as a higher morality, a clearer guide to the social and political relations rather than as a religion, essentially a fixing of the thoughts upon another world. From the supremacy of the King to the suppression of the monasteries there seems to be the same spirit pervading all we do and hold; the Sacraments are neglected, for of course they come in the way of a mere worldly morality; the very tombstones, instead of representing the dead as in the attitude of prayer and with the old inscriptions, “Lord, have mercy,” and so forth, now put before us the exploits and achievements of their lives, with almost disgusting encomiums upon their characters. A life of devotion is not so much as held in honour amongst us, and I question whether, if the characters of Mary and Martha were put before most of us without the names, the latter would not be much preferred. A man who lives on his estate, spending his money decently, and his time in shooting, hunting, and visiting, is thought at least harmless; but one who gives himself up to prayer and devotion is a deserter of his social duties, a deluded fanatic; nay, how few there are, even just after repeating the words, “the effectual fervent prayer of a righteous man availeth much,” who would not be inclined to feel something like contempt for a person who should propose to devote himself to prayer for the benefit of the Church and of his fellow-Christians. And this is not

confined to individuals; the whole body of the clergy seem infected with it; they all seem to look forward to a comfortable parsonage, a quiet easy life, few cares, and, in fact, a happiness which, though religion assists in the formation of, is very very much a worldly one. And what is the cause of it? Nothing, it seems to me, but this—perversion of the doctrine of justification by faith; a different result, it is true, from what the Evangelicals have arrived at, but springing from the same root; the Evangelicals push it out till they bring in a new and arbitrary code of morality, and I confess I think a most shocking one; the generality of English Churchmen develop it into a worldly doctrine which is almost as painful. . . . I do wish charity was more cultivated among us, and it was that feeling which made me first write to you on this subject. . . . Our belief lies deeper than we can fathom, and develops itself but slowly, often lives on and moves us with a wonderful energy, while the expression in which we clothe it would, if acted upon, be most untrue and unscriptural. But this outward expression takes a fearful vengeance upon us; crosses our path at times when, but for it, all would be as clear as the day; calls upon us to attach to it the importance which only belongs to the truth it falsely represents; and often at last succeeds in closing our eyes to the truth. I wish, and I suppose every one wishes, that there were not so many different views and creeds around us. But though we cannot avoid that, yet surely we can avoid the evil very much by not accustoming ourselves to look at negative but at positive truths. For that reason I certainly should wish to discourage the word Protestant, and never to instruct children in our differences with the Church of Rome. We are in continual danger of bigotry whilst we continue to talk as we do; and surely there are doctrines to be found in the Prayers and in that wonderful production, the Catechism, without our searching for the differences between ourselves and other Christians as food for meditation. I hardly know whether I have done right in saying so much as I have done, for I have gone to the very verge of all that I have yet confessed to myself, and I hardly think you would wish me to do more.

But while faith must be tested by life, the corresponding truth, that life needed a hold on definite belief to sustain it, was strong in him:—

*To his Mother**April 7, 1843.*

... I had a conversation with — last night which made me rather uncomfortable on the subject of the present theological movement. . . . He said things which made me start. Such things, I mean, as maintaining that creeds made no difference, and that a man could not be a better man because he realised all the Athanasian Creed. It has often struck me before that what are called Low Church views are a latent form of Socinianism ; it seems a strong thing to say, but I mean that persons who hold those views seem to me not fully to realise to themselves the Divinity of our Lord ; not that they do not believe it, but that it does not run through all their opinions in the way that it ought to do. And I think their indifference to the Creeds is a proof of this ; they do not see how much depends on the right apprehension of this one doctrine, which is surely that which distinguishes revealed religion from mere morality.

In the next letter he returns to the subject of Christian unity and the best means of promoting it :—

May 20, 1843.

... I think you will understand from this what I feel in regard to Dissenters. I do not wish to conceal from them that I think their principles wrong, but what I would urge them to would be holiness of life rather than attendance at Church ; holiness of life such as is described in the Bible, self-denying, taking up the cross, visiting the fatherless and widows, keeping itself unspotted from the world. For sure I am that the holier a man is the more likely he is to come to the Church, and that indeed if he faithfully follow his conscience as surely as Catholic truth is set before him, so surely will he accept it gladly. What I think so important is that the Dissenters should know that we do not wish them to exchange a spiritual life for a mere set of forms, but for a life still more spiritual than they can ever hope to reach when out of communion with the Church. I want them to learn that it is not obedience merely that we require ; it is not that we wish them to submit ; but we invite them solely because we know that in the Church they will be better men. A church is a mere name, a Judaical and

worldly piece of formality, unless by its assistance we can attain to a far higher state of sanctity than we could do without it.

At present so large a portion of this country is overspread with two kinds of formalism : one that of the so-called High Church party, the *Via Media* I mean, who cling to the forms of our Church, and trust in them, though they believe nothing lies beneath them, or if they do think there is some reality at the bottom of them, they think the form quite as important as the reality, and make it as important to be a Churchman as to be an earnest Christian ; the other that of the so-called Evangelicals, who have no outward form but an inward form to which they sacrifice everything ; every thought almost is condemned except that of enumerating past sins, and a man is valued according to the catalogue of his past wickedness, which, of course, every one swells to his utmost power ; the hatred of forms (quite a different thing from the hatred of formalism) is made a form to which they too cling in the same way, regardless of the meaning which lies underneath all their own words.

The next year, 1844, Ward's book, *The Ideal of a Christian Church*, was published. "The object of the book," writes Dean Church,¹ "was twofold." Starting with an "ideal" of what the Christian Church may be expected to be in its various relations to men, it assumes that the Roman Church, and only the Roman Church, satisfies the conditions of what a Church ought to be, and it argues in detail that the English Church, in spite of its professions, utterly and absolutely fails to fulfil them. Temple would never have subscribed to such a doctrine, but he shared in the "sense of short-comings" and the "burning desire for improvement" with which the book was full, and specially he endorsed its expressions of sympathy with the social conditions of the poor. The influence of these and of other points in Ward's teaching are apparent in the following letter :—

¹ Church's *Oxford Movement*, pp. 323, 324.

To his Mother

July 23, 1844.

What you say of Ward's book rather surprises me, and I think you must have misunderstood him extremely. Do you mean, for instance, that it is wrong to feel a "deep and burning hatred" of cruel oppression? Not of course of the oppressor, but of his deeds? Or, again, may we not hate and loathe the selfish policy which I fear cursed England during the last century, and France for several previous centuries, of shutting our eyes to the miseries of the poor, and hiding them out of sight lest they should disturb the equanimity of our minds? I, for my part, can hardly help feeling a "deep and burning hatred" of the Game Laws, which I look upon as monstrously wicked; yet I by no means even feel dislike to those who defend them, though of course I cannot think *so* highly of them. And so I suppose Ward feels toward the Reformation; he looks upon it as a cruel robbery, a robbery of the poor, depriving them of their best inheritance, the fostering care of a most attentive Church. He considers it as in great measure a wilful desertion of principles, and a promulgation of most sinful and immoral heresy. And whatever truth there may be in either of the above views, in this there is no doubt, that it was maintained solely by selfish interests, and that had not Cromwell, Henry VIII.'s minister, bought up the nobility and gentry with the Church property, we should now be in communion with Rome. I cannot join his feeling, but how with his view he could feel otherwise I cannot say.

With regard to the Protestant principle I will tell you what is the practical course of each principle. The Catholic says: "Act upon what you have been taught, believing it to come from God, and do it for His sake: if it is right, you will by degrees gain an inward conviction of it, which nothing can shake; if it is wrong, you will by degrees be led to what is right." The Protestant says: "As soon as you are at the age to reason for yourself, receive nothing without examination and fair proof, and do not let any previous teaching weigh more with you than if you had not come upon it for the first time." You will observe the check upon the first man is his conscience; he receives nothing which contradicts his conscience, and if anything contradicts his conscience, he instantly rejects it. The check upon the latter is his reason; he receives nothing which is not logically shown. The first, for instance, believes the

Bible because he has been taught so to do, and because the more he has used it the more has he been convinced of its being the Word of God; the latter believes it because he thinks there is strong historical reason for believing the account, and such miracles prove it to have come from God. On the former scheme the poor are better off than the rich, because they are less liable to the perplexities of sophistry; on the latter the poor can hardly be called Christians at all, since they have no rational ground for their belief, and all we can say is that God will accept their faith, such as it is.

At this point the home letters cease, owing doubtless to the fact that Temple's family came to reside with him at Oxford.¹ Possibly amongst the causes which led to the move, one may have been the wish of his mother to be near her son at a time of mental strain and anxiety. Some letters to Mr. Scott give Temple's own account of the Ward crisis and of his views thereon:—

BALLIOL, January 10, 1845.

With regard to the proposed measure I have little doubt now that the Test² will be thrown out;³ I can hear nothing but one universal cry against it. In the University itself, I mean the Residents, the majority against it would be at the very smallest ten to one; and I think the Country Masters are not to be taken in by its being tacked on to the measure against Ward. . . . With regard to the condemnation of Ward himself I confess, if I had a vote, I should vote distinctly in his favour; I do not think such a question (a judicial, not a legislative question) ought to come before Convocation, but before the Ecclesiastical Court.

¹ "Earlier Years" Memoir, vol. i. p. 63.

² This Test was a proposal of the Hebdomadal Board to add to the usual subscription to the Articles which was made at the University, a declaration that the subscriber "took them in the sense in which 'they were both first published and were now imposed by the University,' with the penalty of expulsion against any one, lay or clerical, who thrice refused subscription with this declaration." This declaration was regarded as a new Test; hence the name. Church's *Oxford Movement*, pp. 326-328.

³ The Test was ultimately withdrawn, January 23, 1845. Church's *Oxford Movement*, p. 328.

. . . The injustice of the whole measure seems to me to be this: a certain set of Articles is imposed on the clergy, and a certain Court (the Ecclesiastical Court) is empowered to take cognisance of their being fairly subscribed. A man is considered not to have subscribed them fairly (and a man, too, who had no office in the University as Hampden had, but simply a station which *every* priest in the Church of England is capable of holding as such), and instead of bringing him before this Court, the Church is called upon to punish him untried. The thing is either too much or too little, either gross oppression, or gross dereliction of duty to the Church: if he has subscribed the Articles unfairly, he ought not to be allowed to retain his Orders; if he has subscribed the Articles fairly, he ought not to be punished. For observe it is a mere *punishment*. The University cannot plead, as they might perhaps in the case of Hampden, that it was not a *punishment*, but a depriving him of the power of doing mischief. They might say in Hampden's case, "We do not pass any sentence upon his doctrine as an individual, but we think his mode of expressing it so false that we cannot allow him to teach"; but in Ward's case the influence of his book and of his tongue will not be in the slightest degree diminished by his degradation—nay, I have no doubt it will be rather increased.

. . . One thing, I assure you, the Convocation does not dream of, and that is that we are really now ἐπὶ ξυροῦ ἀκμῆς. The flood of Rationalism pouring into the University will soon (if the University does not act very cautiously) become a deluge and sweep everything before it. I really see nothing here except Newman and Ward at all capable of offering even the slightest resistance. The Via Media and the Evangelicals have been regularly laughed at long ago. You may depend upon it, that it is a sure symptom of danger to see, what I see daily more and more, a very high tone of morality, distinctly disjoined from any *religious* feeling; it looks excessively like most determined Heathenism.

A fortnight later there follows a letter entering yet more fully into the details of the conflict. The eagerness of the younger man combined with his deference for the elder friend is noteworthy:—

BALLIOL, January 25, 1845.

. . . Your principal reason for voting is gone, as the Test has been withdrawn; the notice came out yesterday. The two other measures remain unchanged. The Heads certainly would have shown some firmness or obstinacy, whichever it deserves to be called, if they had held out against the battery that was opened upon them. First came a letter from Tait to the Vice-Chancellor accusing the Hebdomadal Board of never consulting their juniors and assuring them that the Test could never be carried; he divided the Church into four Schools, *scilicet*—The Followers of Newman, the Anglo-Catholics, the Evangelicals, and the Eclectic Philosophical School who derive their opinions mostly from Germany; the First of these, of course, would not vote for the Test; the Third might, but it could only be from panic, as they would find it equally stringent against themselves; and the Fourth made it a principle to hate *all* Tests. The Second only remained, the Anglo-Catholics; these, he said, were men of no influence, the School of Rubrics and Church Architecture, the refined, aristocratic, and gentlemanly school, but hardly that of deep thinkers. And even of these he doubted whether very many would support the Test. . . . You will see from my description that I do not much like Tait's pamphlet; yet I think he deserves great praise for coming forward; it is bold and manly, I think, in style and matter, though I liked it so little that I could hardly give it credit for that at first.

Well, next came a letter from Moberly to the Master, addressing him as Ward's natural protector and calling on him to support Ward throughout; Tait, by the by, had only written against the Test and had approved of the other two measures.¹ Moberly opposed the Censure on the ground of the vagueness of the passages selected and the unfair imputation of dishonesty; the Degradation on the same and besides as being illegal, and the Test on every view of it. The Letter is very clever, though I think the argument on the point of dishonesty fails; the Censure cannot mean to say anything of his individual "Good faith," but of the abstract Good Faith of twisting the Articles so much. The argument on the legal question is very good.

¹ Viz. The Condemnation and Degradation of Mr. Ward. See Church's *Oxford Movement*, p. 326.

The next day out came a Legal Opinion from Dodson and Bethel (procured by Roundell Palmer, which is, however, to be kept secret for the present) asserting the illegality both of the Test and Degradation.

Then came a short pamphlet from Keble, and then a longer one from Maurice of Guy's Hospital—Maurice and Keble both attacking the *whole* proceeding. Maurice's defence of Ward is rather characteristic of himself; he expresses strong disagreement with Ward, and even implies that he cannot see how Ward can bring himself to sign the Articles, but meanwhile he contends for great latitude of interpretation, and proceeds to say in what sense he signs the Seventh Article; viz. he does not think the words "everlasting life" at all imply a future state, but are to be explained by the text, "This is life eternal, that they might know Thee," S. John xvii. 3; and so he signs that Article as merely saying that everlasting life, *i.e.* obedience to God's commandments, was only possible then, as now, through our Saviour. One would think the next sentence about "*transitory* promises" would be rather a difficulty. He dwells strongly also on the *inexpediency* of the Censure.

Then came a 'Letter to a Friend' from Hull, attacking the whole proceeding on very much the same ground that I should like to put it myself, namely, the unfairness of making the Convocation a *judicial* body.

Ward's defence followed; the line taken was to show each party successively that they had as great difficulties as he had himself, or at any rate nearly so. I do not think it so good as I had expected, or so good indeed as I think it capable of being made.

Yesterday afternoon the notice was issued withdrawing the Test, and just in the nick of time this morning appeared a Letter of Garbett's to the Bishop of Chichester in defence of the Test. Palmer of Worcester has also defended the Test, but I have not seen his production.

And now a few words about myself and my last letter, lest you should misunderstand me. . . . With regard to my opinion of the fit tribunal for such a cause as the present, I was not thinking about the Censure but only about the Degradation; the Censure will really, I think, be so utterly without weight except in the country that I did not think about it. The Degradation has been now declared by Dodson and Bethel illegal, though the Heads still seem to think otherwise; if it were legal, I should still think

it unfair; a Bill of Pains and Penalties is legal, but still every one, I think, would condemn it. In the "palmy days of Universities" they spoke and spoke with authority; but consider the difference: then Theology was the staple study, and almost everything else was subordinated to it; now (I have heard you express your regret at it) we can hardly be said to have a regular Theological School, with the exception of Durham, in the country; then the mass of the Convocation consisted of residents; now it is just the contrary, and surely the majority of the non-residents are not enough interested in University matters to make themselves masters of the real merits of any controversy *as it grows*, and their hasty judgment when it comes to a crisis cannot be worth much. Yet still it may be a duty to pronounce their opinion, and the smallness of their influence may be rightly imputed not to the Convocation as a body, but to the individuals who choose to vote without very careful consideration; on this head I do not feel clear, but on the Degradation the more I think of it, the less I like it. It is not merely the inexpediency of the measure, but the (as it appears to me) injustice of having a man tried before a court which is at once judge and jury. The same men (*sc.* each for himself) are to decide what evidence is to be admitted for the meaning of the selected passages, which is the judge's business, and what is the value of that evidence, which is the jury's, and whether the acts (if proved) are contrary to the Laws of the Church, which is again the judge's; and all this not with careful consideration of the arguments on both sides (—, for instance, says that he does not intend to read Ward's defence), but surely (very many of the voters) on a general view of the mischievous tendency of Ward's doctrines; and for the inexpediency of such a course, I should say nothing of it if it were against all alike. He might, as you say, have faith that fit defenders of the Church would be raised up within her, if we resolutely rejected both forms of error; but surely if we retain the one set of men and drive out the other, if we thus, as it were, reject the close adherence to principle and follow expediency, not driving out those who hold wrong doctrines *as such*, but *because* those doctrines are dangerous, I do not see what right we have to expect the same interposition in our favour. It may be right to throw off the dread of rationalism and drive out the Romanisers, but it cannot be right at the same time to retain the late

"Declarationists," who certainly differ quite as widely from our formularies in many important points. . . .

Now please, my dear Scott, to tell me if I have said anything you think wrong; one is apt in a time of so much excitement to express opinions hastily and unwisely; but you cannot wonder that I am very much interested.

Finally a month later comes the news which greatly affected Temple's view of the situation:—

BALLIOL, February 24, 1845.

MY DEAR SCOTT—Many thanks for your very kind letter, which I was very glad to have. Meanwhile, however, news has arrived which has rather seriously diminished Ward's influence over me, and I think over many others. In fact, our grand tragedy of the week before last has been turned into comedy in the most ridiculous way; while the crash of the great catastrophe, and the last warning words of that voice which bid the nation beware what it was about to do, were still ringing in our ears, a report suddenly reached Oxford that the prophet was very comfortable about the matter, as he had been for the last month engaged to be married; and the report was true! Yes, last Term, which was spent by the two parties in preparing for the coming struggle, was spent by Ward in making love, and in January he was accepted. I do not at all blame him for marrying, nor do I feel he has done *wrong* in that, even on his own principles; but I think he might as well have let it out before the great row, and I certainly think it alters the character of his book most completely. It has given me in that way very great pain. From his book and the general style of his conversation I had painted him to myself as such a very great man; one who without any affectation was really feeling and practising all he taught; and I certainly never dreamt, that with such a deep admiration of the Roman system, and such a deep conviction that the adoption of a similar system was the only remedy for our miserable state, he would take a step which, so far as he is concerned, must always form the most insuperable barrier to the introduction of any such system. I suppose the sudden surprise has rather deprived me of the power of judging fairly, but I feel at present as if such an inconsistency reduced his book to a

mere bubble, and his opinions and convictions to mere effervescence of a warm imagination.

The letter concludes with mention of a renewed offer of a Rugby Mastership :—

Tait has been looking out for a master to take Grenville's place at Rugby, who is so ill that he cannot continue there any longer. I have, however, declined. First, I feel myself in a useful position here, and one which I ought not to leave at present except for very strong reasons; and secondly, I think I am hardly old enough; and thirdly, I am quite sure I have not read nearly enough to justify me in almost closing my personal studies, for I feel sure that it would come to that; so that unless my friends find some very strong arguments for my taking it, I think I may consider it settled. . . .
—Yours very affectionately, F. TEMPLE.

There now comes a break in all correspondence for more than two years. The period of silence was eventful in his personal history. It was like a passage through a tunnel; on emerging the traveller finds himself in new country presenting new features. When letters are again forthcoming he had become sufficiently settled in his own mind to seek ordination from Bishop Wilberforce.¹

In the interval he had been studying other subjects besides theology, and had been much with other friends, who turned his thoughts in other directions. He became a learner in the School of Kant, and found in the German philosopher, like S. T. Coleridge and many another, a source of inspiration. He was engaged with Jowett in a translation of Hegel's *Logic*.² The cause of University Reform began to be mooted, and his friend, Robert Lingen, commenced his work at the office of the Privy Council, and Temple was

¹ Twenty-five years afterwards the impression made on the Bishop's mind by the personality of the candidate was still vivid. See "*Exeter*" Memoir, vol. i. p. 277.

² "*Earlier Years*" Memoir, vol. i. p. 78.

gradually drawn into the stream of educational interest with which his after-life was to be so closely connected.¹ The catastrophe which overtook the followers of Dr. Newman at the commencement of 1845 was, says Dean Church,² "the birthday of the modern Liberalism of Oxford," and it was natural for Temple's eager spirit to watch its rise with increasing sympathy and interest. It was already evident that while the quick current of the Oxford life had changed the old religious standpoint of his early days, it had also detached him from the creed of the political Tory. Ward's idealism had affected him in secular as well as in theological matters. Its picture of the sympathy of the mediæval Church with the poor had attracted him towards a liberalism of which the basis was not political economy but religious enthusiasm. Moreover, he had increasingly been learning to place the whole ordering of his life under the control of an inner principle. The self-government of a free conscience was the rock on which both the theology and the politics of his future years were to stand.

Temple never accepted the Roman position,³ but that there had been some drawing towards the port in which many of the followers of the Oxford school ultimately took refuge, no one can doubt. There were, however, causes which held him back. One great deterrent was doubtless the close of the Ward incident. Laughable rather than tragic, and certainly not heroic, it was just of the kind to affect Temple, because it did not ring quite true. It was a voluntary renunciation of an ideal, without any recognition on the part of the man who had set

¹ "Earlier Years" Memoir, vol. i. pp. 73-75.

² Dean Church's *Oxford Movement*, 1891, p. 340.

³ Even in the year 1843—the period in which he was most drawn in that direction—he writes to his friend Coleridge: "I must confess, however, that I have liked Roman Catholicism less hitherto the more I have known of it." (*Life and Correspondence of Lord Coleridge* vol. i. p. 12.)

it up that he had renounced it; and there is no doubt that the act had a chilling effect upon Temple and gave him pause. It was something like the fall of an idol. But Ward's defection brought a trial from the opposite side—it might have produced in Temple the same fluidity of religious belief which was the result in the case of not a few who came in contact with the Oxford Movement; falling away from that, he might have fallen from much besides, and have lost his hold on vital truths. What was it which preserved him from the twofold danger?

First, the training of his early home. Years afterwards he said more than once that the great stand-by when doubts came in mature life was the memory and the power of the teaching of a good home. "They give you," he said, "time to turn round and see where you are; they are a rock against which to steady yourself when the rush of waters drives past, so that you are not swept away while the storm is at its height." He spoke as one who had reason to know, and it was the sense of all that a good home had been to him which made him so strong a friend of what he believed to be religious education of the right sort.

Secondly, he was held fast because of elements which entered into his conception of faith—enlightenment of the intellect, conviction of the conscience, and action of the will. This view of the composite character of faith he may have originally gained from Coleridge,¹ but he made it his own—he learnt to live by it. Conscience and will were allies; they came to the help of each other, and the result was the life of duty. In the power of such a faith he travelled far from many of the conclusions of the Oxford school, and he never took refuge in the security of a narrow creed, hedged

¹ "London" Memoir, pp. 70-72.

round and timorous. But there were legacies of the school which he never lost—an awe and reverence about his religion and worship which all could see, and the sense of a supernatural presence which inspired them—an elevation of aim in daily life which lifted him above conventional standards, while nevertheless he remained absolutely simple, and lived his life in common things—a belief that the Church (though he gave no narrow interpretation of the term) was no convenient institution framed by man, but the creation of Christ Himself—a hold on things unseen which made the world beyond the grave and the communion of saints perpetual realities to him—above all, a belief in the objectivity of the Christian Faith, with the Cross and the Resurrection and the Divine Sonship of Christ as the Centre and the Head. “Our Lord is the crown, nay, the very substance of all revelation.” . . . “If He cannot convince the soul, no other can. The believer stakes all faith on His truth; all hope on His power.”¹

Amidst all the results of the stress and contention which marked the Oxford of those days this may stand to its credit, that, both in what was taken by him and in what he stood firm to reject, it helped to form the character of Frederick Temple. Few will deny that special charm and beauty attach to those years of his life in which he came most closely beneath the influence of the Oxford Movement.

¹ Temple's *Bampton Lectures*, p. 251.

CHAPTER II

DISCIPLINE

Choice of future line of life—Education Office and Kneller Hall—Hopes on leaving Oxford—Incidental interests: Theological, educational, political; illustrated by correspondence with Scott and Lawson—University Reform and Oxford Local Examinations—Cause of failure of Kneller Hall, attitude of the clergy (Coleridge correspondence), attitude of the Government (Scott correspondence)—Resignation of Principalship—Depression under sense of failure—Influence of official life and experience of Kneller Hall on character.

IN a letter written to his mother, within a week of his success in the classical schools, Temple speaks of himself as about to enter upon a new section of his life: "henceforth I am comparatively my own tutor." But he wrote before the event; he did not fully enter upon his manhood until after he left the University. As long as he was there—even when tutor of a college—he was drinking in the influences of the place at every pore, and they, not he, were the master. But after he left Oxford positions were reversed. He was still a receiver and remained such all his life. Not until he was leaving London, at the age of seventy-five, did he say, "I shall always look back to my holding of the Diocese of London as the special time when my education may be said to have been completed." But after he left Oxford he was all along using the influences; they were not master-

ing *him*. He had entered upon the full inheritance of his manhood.

During the final years of his stay there he had been making up his mind as to his future line of life, and in the early autumn of 1847 the choice was made :—

To his sister Katy

BRIDLINGTON QUAY, *August 26, 1847.*

. . . I have had a letter to-day from Lingen, who is one of the Government School Inspectors, asking me to let him mention my name for the Headship of the Normal School which the Government are about to establish. He says he thinks they should be sure of having it if I chose to offer, and that though "the salary cannot be equal to that of Rugby or Harrow, or any of the great public schools which on a vacancy might be within my grasp," still the position would be an important one, and I should in fact be the "Minister of Education in the new Poor Law." There is much that is tempting to me in the scheme. It has been my dream for years to devote my full strength as soon as I had it to the Education of the Poor, and it would amuse you to see some of the magnificent and comprehensive plans I have made of what I should wish to see done. I have never thought much about it, simply because I could see no possibility of realising my fancies, but I have often looked forward to commencing some day a real system of Education, such as the poor in this country have not yet. And now it seems as if my vision had suddenly assumed a substantial shape; and means were given me, which I might use to do all I could wish,—but then independence, and how far can a Government officer be independent?—and what would become of my ideas if I found myself only an instrument for developing the projects of others? And the papers? And the Whigs? I am very doubtful about the matter. I do not know what the salary is yet; for itself I do not much care about that, but in this case the salary is the symbol of the position, and I would not take it under £1000 a year; less than that being offered would make me feel at once that they wanted an underling, to teach the people what he was told, not to educate them.

*To his Mother**September 1, 1847.*

This Central School has taken my fancy much. It is no great prospect from a worldly point of view—I do not expect they would give a quarter as much as I should have fair reason to expect in many positions. The post too, as they describe it themselves, is one of labour, difficulty, and risk: the risk being the fact of their own cowardice, for they fear the outcries of the Dissenters may force them to abandon the scheme. With all this it is a post of greater usefulness than I could possibly hope for in any other way. And after all I really have no desire to be a rich man. I wish you would not be unwell, . . . you ought after all your wanderings to be quite well. What will you say to moving once again and leaving dear old Oxford and all the Fellows of Balliol, if I get this place, or rather this place gets me? . . . The school is to be at Twickenham, which is very pretty with both wood and water, the beauty of flat scenery, but very good of its kind.

He left Oxford full of enthusiasm. There is a passage in his essay on the Education of the World¹ which reads like a bit of autobiography, and speaks of a glow which had not wholly faded when he accepted the appointment of Kneller Hall:—

This then (the power of example) which is born with our birth and dies with our death, attains its maximum at some point in the passage from one to the other. And this point is just the meeting point of the child and the man, the brief interval which separates restraint from liberty. Young men at this period are learning a peculiar lesson. They seem to those who talk to them to be imbibing from their associates and their studies principles both of faith and conduct. But the rapid fluctuations of their minds show that their opinions have not really the nature of principles. They are really learning, not principles, but the materials out of which principles are made. They drink in the lessons of generous impulse, warm unselfishness, courage, self-devotion, romantic disregard of worldly calculations, without knowing what are

¹ *Essays and Reviews*, p. 22.

the grounds of their own approbation, or caring to analyse the laws and ascertain the limits of such guides of conduct. They believe, without exact attention to the evidence of their belief; and their opinions have accordingly the richness and warmth that belong to sentiment, but not the clearness or firmness that can be given by reason. These affections, which are now kindled in their hearts by the contact of their fellows, will afterwards be the reservoir of life and light, with which their faith and their highest conceptions will be animated and coloured. . . . And hence the lessons of this time have such an attractiveness in their warmth and life, that they are very reluctantly exchanged for the truer and profounder, but at first sight colder wisdom which is destined to follow them. To almost all men this period is a bright spot to which the memory ever afterwards loves to recur. . . . This is the seed-time of the soul's harvest, and contains the promise of the year. . . . The after-life may be more contented, but can rarely be so glad and joyous. Two things we need to crown its blessing—one is, that the friends whom we then learn to love, and the opinions which we then learn to cherish, may stand the test of time, and deserve the esteem and approval of calmer thoughts and wider experience; the other, that our hearts may have depth enough to drink largely of that which God is holding to our lips, and never again to lose the fire and spirit of the draught. There is nothing more beautiful than a manhood surrounded by the friends, upholding the principles, and filled with the energy of the spring-time of life. But even if these highest blessings be denied, if we have been compelled to change opinions, and to give up friends, and the cold experience of the world has extinguished the heat of youth, still the heart will instinctively recur to that happy time, to explain to itself what is meant by love and what by happiness.

His own youth had undergone a special discipline; but it had not drilled the brightness out of him, and he took much of it, along with the steadfastness of purpose which had been matured in the school of poverty and mental strain, to the Council Office and Kneller Hall.

For the earlier years of his life the home correspondence has been the best source of information; for his manhood a good commentary is found

in his letters to his friends. It is interesting to compare Temple's relationships with his fellows with those of other men. He founded no special school of disciples like Arnold, and he can scarcely be said to have had a genius for friendship like Jowett. Both Jowett and Temple were educators of the young, but, unlike his friend, Temple did not follow the individual life of a great number of young men with those evident tokens of desire that they should make the very best of themselves, which are given by much intercourse and a continuous and wide private correspondence. The difference is no doubt partly due to the fact that Temple's educational work was chiefly done not as tutor of a college, but as the head of a large school, and that in this position he would be brought into contact with young life on its collective rather than on its individual side. Partly, the difference must be set down to Temple's training, which had thrown him on his own resources and compelled him to stand much alone. The result was a strong conviction on his part that it was best for a man to make his own life: "My brother will always be glad to see you, and he will mean you to come; he will not invite you—it is not his way—but you must come all the same; he will not like it if you do not." These words, spoken to a pupil in early days, were true of Dr. Temple always. "You must *go at* the Bishop if you want to get anything out of him," was the advice of the same pupil in after years, and good advice if given to the right kind of person. Frederick Temple was not a man of *many* friends—he attracted but he never enticed—and he never allowed friendship to lessen individual responsibility; but his friendships for those inside the circle were strong and warm. His choice of friends was characteristic. Captivated by cleverness and

ability, he was not permanently drawn to them, if they were the main characteristics. Of correspondence outside his own family, the longest and most continuous is that with Robert Scott; on his own showing¹ his dearest friend was Robert Lawson. In the former case, the attraction was a sense of thoughtful kindness received, and deep respect for genuine learning, single-mindedness, and conscientious discharge of duty; in the latter case the bond of friendship was sympathy with a refined and spiritual nature.

A full account of the work at Kneller Hall has been given in Mr. Roby's Memoir.² Some allusion to it, and specially with reference to its effect on personal character, will be made later on. Outside it were many INCIDENTAL INTERESTS—theological, educational, political—under which his life and mind expanded. The chief of these was

I. THEOLOGY

In the midst of busy hours he found time to cultivate his taste for *exegetical* study of the Bible.

The beginnings of it are to be found in Blundell days,³ and it continued through life, perpetually coming out in his sermons, and frequently forming the subject of correspondence with his son William, and of interesting conversation with experts. In Mr. Scott he had an admirable referee:—

KNELLER HALL, April 5, 1853.

. . . Do you remember the paper you sent me on Galatians iii. 20?

I have thought about it often since. I cannot come to your view. It seems to me very un-Pauline. The other instances which you adduce of S. Paul's approaching S.

¹ He spoke in this sense in the Guildhall, Exeter, 1897.

² "Education Office" Memoir, vol. i. pp. 98-114.

³ *Supra*, p. 406.

John seem to me to tell against you. The chapter on Charity is wonderfully unlike anything that S. John says on Love; so unlike as to be a proof how *very* differently the two Apostles must have viewed the truths they taught, since they could write so differently on a point where it was not possible that there should be a difference of opinion.

S. John is in fact always the ideal. S. Paul always the practical. And this influences their modes of expressing even such doctrines as that of the Trinity. S. Paul always seems to ascend from earth; S. John to descend from Heaven. With S. Paul, if I may say it reverently, the Lord is the subject and Son of God the predicate; with S. John, it is always the reverse. The Resurrection is S. Paul's leading topic; the Incarnation S. John's.

For this reason I cannot think that S. Paul could have used the expression, "God is one," to signify His Oneness in the Trinity. There is an absence in such an argument of an immediate *practical* relation to us, which seems to be absolutely invariable in S. Paul's writing.

I prefer to take the argument in this sense. The law was ordained for a temporary purpose and showed its temporary character by being given through a Mediator. For God, being the eternal unity, can make no abiding covenant with any except those whom He so unites with Himself as to exclude the notion of a Mediator altogether.

Or to put it in another way—a mediator implies separation, and a covenant made through a mediator implies perpetual separation while the covenant lasts. Such a covenant therefore cannot be eternal, for God the Eternal One cannot allow perpetual separation from Himself.

This you will see includes the idea of the Trinity, but implicitly, not explicitly.

Exegetical questions had their natural connexion with *doctrinal*. A little later he writes on the development of 'doctrine in S. Paul's Epistles:—

KNELLER HALL, December 1, 1852.

DEAR SCOTT—Have you ever looked at all at the modifications of doctrinal statement indicated by the succession of S. Paul's Epistles? Without at all touching the question of a complete or gradual revelation, there is, I think, enough to show that the *statement* of doctrine was influenced by the

increase of experience, by the pressure of circumstances, and by the current of controversy. Could it be otherwise without turning the Apostles into mere mouthpieces, which we certainly know that they were not?

S. Paul's early preaching seems to me to have dwelt on the Kingdom. When at Thessalonica he was accused of seditious conduct in preaching another King, one Jesus. Three or four weeks after he writes the First Epistle to the Thessalonians. Every chapter ends with an allusion to the coming of the Lord. The idea of Christian duty is so summed up in patient waiting that we hardly see anything of growth in grace or of a work to be done in this world before we go. The Jews are spoken of as given quite over (ii. 16). But the most striking characteristic of the Epistle comes out when we compare the passage, iv. 13-18, with that in 1 Cor. xv. In both cases the Apostle is writing about a doubt of the Resurrection. In the one Epistle this is treated as if the dead only were concerned in it. As for the living they are addressed as if in all human probability they were sure of beholding the glorious end with their own eyes. In the other Epistle, on the contrary, it is all for the living that he writes: "If in this life only we have hope in Christ we are of all men most miserable." The whole tone of this first Epistle [1 Thess.—Ed.] is in fact outward; Christ after the flesh, not inward peace, or a sense of pardon, or experience working hope, or the new creature; still less the greater doctrines of election, and atonement, and original sin are prominent here. The Day of Judgment overshadows everything. In the second Epistle [2 Thess.—Ed.] the Day of Judgment has receded. There is a time of trouble to come first. It puts one in mind of the seventh chapter of Isaiah, which first promises the Messiah, and then adds that 'before He shall come the whole land will be shorn with a hired razor, and that days shall come such as had not been since the days of the separation. So here Antichrist comes in before Christ. Yet even here the waiting for Christ is the leading thought.

Next come the great controversial Epistles, and controversy from its very nature turns the eyes from the future to the present, or rather to the abstract. The idea of the Gospel in the Epistle to the Galatians is not Triumph but Liberty; *life* in the spirit; *this* life not the *next*. The change is perhaps rather caused by circumstances than by time. We cannot see any proof of a modified feeling within

the Apostle's mind, but only that a different tone was required by his hearers and his subject. Yet surely had he written on this subject at the same date as when he wrote the two former Epistles it would have been otherwise worded.

His whole tone has become more abstract, more spiritual, less mixed up with temporal notions of the future. The new creature is insisted on. The life within is a leading thought. We wait, not for the Kingdom, but for the hope of righteousness.

The Epistles to the Corinthians succeeded the Galatians too soon to leave room for much change. But if we compare them at the points of contact with the Epistles to the Thessalonians the difference is marked enough.

In the first Epistle to the Corinthians we still just hear of the Kingdom, soon to come, as in iv. 9, and probably in vii. 29. But this disappears in the second Epistle, and the Day of Judgment takes the place of the Advent.

In the Epistle to the Romans we have got fairly out of all modes of statement which can be called after the flesh. A whole future is evidently expected before the Advent, a future in which the Jews are to be converted (xi. 25).

Christian doctrine now rests upon deep spiritual foundations. Original sin, hinted at in 2 Cor. v. 14, is clearly stated. The Atonement is clearly brought out on the other side. The process of inner conversion is traced (vii. 7-25). Redemption is described in spiritual characters (viii.).

The relation of the Law to the Gospels is traced much more profoundly than in the Epistle to the Galatians. The Law is no longer "the weak and beggarly element," but "holy and just and good." Yet again the law is no longer "the schoolmaster to bring us unto Christ," but it is that "by which sin took occasion to slay me." It is striking thus to see the deeper statement absorb the shallower and yet leave the full truth of the latter untouched.

Now, too, the force of facts wrings from the Apostle the deep doctrine of election.

The practical questions were everything in writing to Corinth. Here they are quite subordinate. This, of course, in part arises from the nature of the case. But partly too from the movement of the Apostle's mind, who is evidently much more attracted now to this teaching than he was.

But all through these four Epistles the Gospel is a life and not a waiting, while in the Epistles to the Thessalonians it is just the other way.

In the profoundest depths of human consciousness lie the approaches to Heaven. As Christian life grows everything else dwarfs in comparison with one figure which ever grows in fulness. He who looks back on London after passing through it is struck with the majesty with which S. Paul's towers over all the town.

Other things which seemed of infinite importance at the time sink to nothing before the eyes of the Apostle in comparison with the Person of Christ.

The three last Epistles are hardly doctrinal in the same sense that their predecessors are. The one Image fills them all. The example of Christ in the Epistle to the Philippians, the power and indwelling presence in that to the Colossians, the life of the Church flowing from Christ in that to the Ephesians. So strongly has this seized him that he who once denounced God's wrath against his opponents (Gal. i. 8, 9) now is content with anything provided Christ be preached (Phil. i. 18). The Trinity, which has been just touched on before, now seems to fill his soul. The coming of Christ is again expected; but not as before to judge the world, but to change us into His likeness (Phil. iii. 21).

Is not this the History of all Christian experience? Do we not begin by reading doctrinal statements and by taking deep interest in controversy, and end, if we end aright, in fixing our thoughts on one Image only? Not that we can come to that end all at once; for there is a vast difference between his experience who hath humbly looked into the things set before him, and his who hath passed them by because he sees older Christians need them no longer.

What do you think of all this? A dream or a reality? It seems to me to throw a light upon the Epistles.—Yours affectionately,

F. TEMPLE.

The following letter relates to a subject of perpetual interest :—

November 11, 1853.

. . . You see what is the end of Maurice. Do you not think that the tendency of Protestant Theology has made the question of Eternal Punishment extremely difficult? The doctrine of Purgatory left an opening for the mind to escape from consigning the vast proportion of very questionable cases to eternal death. By giving up that doctrine we are forced to send all to Heaven or Hell. The conscience

shrinks from this. Now the Roman doctrine of Purgatory, when joined to that of Indulgences, Pardons, and the like, is immoral, and when drawn out into the details of fire and the like is presumptuous. But while we deny the *Roman* doctrine, we need not deny the existence, surely, of *some* means of purification whereby the half regenerate may be made perfect after death. What do you think?

This handling of the subject in correspondence with the theologian of standing may be compared with the careful way in which he answers an inquiry about it, made in later years by a former pupil, with the detailed reference to passages of the Bible, and finally to the pupil's own judgment:—

To E. M. Oakeley

RUGBY, *February 6, 1866.*

. . . I fear I cannot do much to help you in finding books worth reading on the Doctrine of Punishment hereafter.

The case is this: the great bulk of Christians have always believed that the Punishments spoken of in the New Testament will last for ever. But from this general statement must be taken three large deductions. First, there has always been a minority (sometimes very small) that did not accept this. Second, the whole Roman Catholic Church have completely altered the meaning of the doctrine by adding to it the doctrine of Purgatory. Thirdly, the great mass of Protestants has always practically (whatever they may *say*) assumed that all except very wicked people indeed *will* be forgiven for Christ's sake. But now even these modifications no longer satisfy all men; and the grounds of the doctrine itself are being examined. But this examination has in reality only just begun. It cannot be said that there is any literature of the subject to which a student may be referred. What you have to do is to examine what the New Testament says upon it. The following hints may perhaps help you:—

First examine our Lord's words on the subject, particularly S. Matt. v. 26, xviii. 8, xvi. 26; S. Luke xii. 59; S. Mark ix. 44; S. Matt. xxv. 46; S. Luke xvi. 26; S. Matt. xii. 32.

Next examine the words of the Apostles, particularly

1 Cor. iii. 11-17, viii. 11, xv. 26; Phil. i. 28; 2 Thess. 1-9; Heb. vi. 4-6, x. 26; 1 Pet. iv. 18; 2 Pet. ii. 17; 2 Pet. iii. 7; 1 John v. 16; Jude 13; Rev. xx. 15, xix. 20, xxi. 27, xxii. 11, 15.

Next come the various modes of interpretation to be considered.

First, how far are the expressions Jewish? And here must be considered the peculiar frequency of the expression "for ever" in the Old Testament, a frequency quite unique in National Literature; and along with this frequency must be observed the meaning which the Jews therefore attached to the word. Secondly, how far are the strongest expressions mere quotations and therefore, as must always be the case with quotations, less forcible? See particularly Mark ix. 44 as illustrated by Isaiah lxvi. 24.

Thirdly, how far the expressions are figurative, and if figurative in regard to the character of the punishment may also be figurative in regard to the duration of it.

Lastly, how far the expressions are purposely ideal, intentionally leaving us in ignorance whether the ideal shall in any case be realised.

If you follow this line of thought and study, you will, I think, come to the conclusion which will be thoroughly your own, and in which you can therefore conscientiously rest.—
Yours ever,

F. TEMPLE.

In 1850 the Gorham controversy brought the doctrine of baptismal regeneration prominently forward. The following letters have reference to the subject. The tone in Bishop Temple's Confirmation charges was more direct and positive (another illustration, though of a somewhat different kind, of the difference which he made in relations with young and old), but on the whole the letters contain a permanent expression of his views:—

To Mr. Scott

January 3, 1850.

The Baptismal Service, as it stands in the Prayer Book, I heartily agree with on the whole; but particular expressions in it I would gladly see changed. The words "to regenerate him *with* Thy Holy Spirit" appear to me likely to mislead.

In arguing the question on grounds of Scripture the High Church divines tend to lay down, sometimes actually lay down, that whatever is said of Baptism in the Epistles then may be said of Baptism by us now. This is not fair. Baptism then, being the Baptism of adults (generally at any rate), involved an act of will on the part of the Baptized; but, what is still more to the point, it involved such concomitants as at once gave a strong guarantee for the requisite faith and repentance, and at the same time concentrated into the single act a whole life of struggle. The Baptized man stepped almost by that one act into a totally new life. He lived in the closest intimacy with new associates. He was cut off from many whom he had loved before. He was liable to terrible persecutions. That one act made it impossible to plead that he was not a Christian. Before he was still free: convinced in heart he might still say to any persecutor that he had not joined the hated sect: after his Baptism he could go back no more. Without any reference to the theological question the step was irrevocable: for if he did relapse, he could never be again what he had been before.

What wonder that with this notion of Baptism in their minds the Apostles and the Fathers should speak as if Baptism were in the most absolute sense the Gate of the Kingdom of Heaven? With the mouth confession is made unto salvation, says S. Paul; as if the one act by which a man definitely committed himself summed up the whole of the internal conflict and what remained was nothing.

Still further, S. Paul was converted in an instant. The miraculous vision of our Lord worked in him at one stroke what in ordinary minds is the result of sometimes a lifelong struggle. And I think it quite plain that the circumstances of his own conversion always unconsciously influence his language. The form in which the passing from life unto death presents itself to his mind is that of a single plunge. It is this which the Methodists have seized on, and represented as the normal mode of conversion; whereas it is as far from being the normal mode as S. Paul's case was from being the type of the call of an Apostle.

There is, however, one passage in which I cannot help thinking that S. Paul treats of regeneration not, as he usually does, as if it were a point, but as if it were a process. I mean the famous conclusion of the seventh chapter of the Romans. It is, I know, a great controversy whether this

passage applies to the Regenerate or the Unregenerate. It seems to me to apply to those who are being regenerated. It describes the struggle from the state of innocence (*i.e.* unconsciousness of sin) up to the final victory. To say that this description does not now apply to the Baptized seems to be absurd; to say that the Apostle meant it then to apply to the regenerate cuts the very thread of his argument. It is in fact a description of what we all have to pass through. In their days so much of it was concentrated into the act of Baptism that he who was unbaptized might be considered as near the beginning of it, he who was baptized as near the end of it. But it would be absurd to say the same now.

The Roman Catholics, however, and with them Pusey, maintain that Baptism is just what it was; that the same change takes place within, the same (not *an*, but the *same*) irrevocable character attaches to the ordinance; that we ought to expect children baptized in infancy to occupy the same moral and spiritual position as the Baptized would in the days of the Apostles. If you point to the fact that it is not so, they reply by laudations of the early Church and laments over the depth to which we have fallen.

In short I will sum up thus. If you insist that there must be in any man's life one marked passage from death unto life, in which the greatest portion or the whole of the internal change to be worked in a man's heart is summed up, and if you call *this* Regeneration, then you cannot say that Infants are regenerated in Baptism; so far I agree with the Methodists. But if you say that the process with most men is a slow and imperceptible one throughout, and in all men a slow and imperceptible one to some extent, and apply the word regeneration either to the beginning of this process or (as I think more rightly) to the most marked point in this beginning, then I know no expression which so well suits the meaning. What do you say to this? I have tried to avoid expressing myself in the ordinary metaphors; because metaphors in such a subject after being used for a little while cease to have any meaning at all; and many that have been applied to this particular matter have a materialistic tendency clinging to them which damages the discussion.

I have thought much on the subject. 'Perhaps we do not *quite* agree, but I am convinced we do not far differ, and I should much like to know in what way my answer to the question strikes you.

January 14, 1850.

When men agree on the practical view of a question, I think the chances are great that any other difference is but one of expression arising probably from their minds being accustomed to different metaphors.

I will try to explain myself more fully in regard to the Baptism of Infants.

In the process of Regeneration it is clear that there are two powers at work: natural conscience and the grace of God. How much is done by each no one can tell. It is one of the essential characteristics of Christianity that the line between the natural and the supernatural can never be sharply drawn. And in fact the attempt to draw it and to claim for certain emotions a distinctly supernatural origin, while others are as definitely natural, has almost invariably ended, if pushed to consequences, in mere fanaticism.

This being the case, we cannot say at what exact point in the process of Regeneration that grace of God is given, without which, however far natural conscience may take a man, it cannot carry him to the end. Nay more, that grace may in some instances be given early and help the man over the first steps in his course, in others later and not till he has advanced some way.

I hold then that in Baptism the infant receives the positive assurance of that grace, given then and to be given afterwards in *such measure as his progress in the course successively requires*.

The infant cannot, in the strict sense of the word, perform an act of Will; neither then does he receive the grace which will assist him in acts of Will. And it is *this* grace which men ordinarily mean when they speak of the gift of the Holy Spirit.

But his day of grace is in his Baptism positively promised and will certainly come; will certainly come at the time when it is best for him that it should come; but may be rejected then by himself.

More than this I do not like to say. Baptism in the days of S. Paul included three things: 1. Instruction in the outline of the Faith. 2. The Sacrament. 3. The profession of Christianity, with all its consequences, in those days so tremendous. With us these three things are separated from one another, and the first and last instead of being concentrated into single moments or short periods are spread over years. Baptism at that time conferred the fulness of Christian

privileges. Baptism in our day does the same when it involves the same three things. To the man who has been baptized in infancy, has been instructed in youth, and has openly acted up to his vocation when he could act for himself, to such a man is given whatever was given in the days of S. Paul. The New Testament nowhere distinctly defines the portion of grace assigned to the bare Sacrament deprived of the concomitants in those days always attached to it. Neither can I define it.

The Schoolmen did define it. And their rigid theology has certainly influenced our formularies. But their theology was forced to be rigid. A system built of syllogisms falls to pieces if a definition be wanting. Our theology is not built of syllogisms, and is not therefore compelled to define every term that it uses.

The Schoolmen, with that singular union of servility and honesty which always characterises them, define exactly the blessings of Baptism, and add to their definition an extension which is so elastic as to admit almost all shades of opinion. They say that Baptism confers a "character" and impresses an indelible stamp on the soul, which never ceases to influence the whole man for the rest of his life, either as a savour of life unto life or of death unto death. This, then, they say is the peculiar privilege of the baptized.

But then they proceed further to say that Baptism is of three kinds: by Water (the regular sacrament), by Blood (the death of an unbaptized martyr), and by Fire. This last they explain to take place when a man who has been unbaptized from causes over which he had no control is regenerated, notwithstanding, by the fervour of his love to God. The *peculiar* privilege of the baptized is thus very widely extended. And in fact the limitation here, viz. "unbaptized from causes over which he had no control," is so very elastic that it would easily, without requiring a bit more subtlety than the Schoolmen *often* indulge in, admit the Quakers and Baptists.

We, however, show a tendency to retain in some cases the rigid dogmatism of the Schoolmen, but to reject these safety valves with which alone their engine could work without mischief. The difference between our days and those of the early Church in regard to the concentration of so much of the Christian's probation into short periods is not peculiar to this matter. The same thing can be traced in the expectations which they had formed of the speedy coming of the

Day of Judgment. In fact the tendency to gather up into points what in ordinary life covers long spaces is the characteristic of all great moral epochs. At such periods men live through a great deal in a very short time, and in looking forward to the future view things as summed up in one or two short revolutions, which yet when that epoch has passed develop into slow and gradual changes, covering ages in their course.

To Mr. Scott

January 20, 1850.

Petrifaction is worse as well as better than Putrefaction, and the choice between them is not so easy. Putrefaction is offensive; but petrifaction is hopeless. The one which is the least pleasing to eye and nostril at least contains the elements of new life; the other can never hope for a higher destiny than the specimen-collector's museum.

Some of your expressions I agree in; others I do not quite like. "Heir" and "inheritance" suit my meaning admirably; "seed" does not please me.

There seems to me to be a materialistic tendency about the latter expression here.

By the side of your image let me place mine. I think of the stream of life in each man's heart as a river whose essential characteristic is that it consists of a mixture of two waters: the one that well-spring that comes from within or natural conscience; the other that gracious outpouring whose source is in the Eternal hills, the gift of God: the first begins to flow at a man's natural birth, and though it may be sluggish, may be choked up with weeds, may lose itself in sands, its course while it flows at all is towards the sea of immortality: the sluices of the second are unlocked at baptism; it is not seen, for it flows underground, till the moment when it joins the other stream, but when that moment will be is hid in God's providence.

Again, with regard to the expression 'regenerate with thy Holy Spirit,' I admit your defence as a technical one; but not as a practical one. Our people, as I said before, understand by the gift of the Spirit that gift which belongs not (to use your own expression) to the regeneration but to the new birth. In the first place, therefore, a great many inevitably misunderstand the expression; in the second place, a great many unable to understand and unwilling to misunderstand attach no meaning to it at all; in the third, it is a convenient

handle to one party to teach what seems to me error. You will answer, teach people the meaning of it. But the case is this. The essential characteristic of the Church of England is that she teaches her people by getting them to read the Bible; the *peculiar* characteristic, for with those Protestants who are always crying 'the Bible and the Bible only,' you will always find that the preacher and his living voice quite supersede the Bible as the teaching agent. This being the case it is almost impossible to teach the mass of people except through such phrases as are current in the Bible. Now to an ordinary reader of the Bible the gift of the Spirit invariably means and will invariably mean that full influence which belongs not to baptism by itself but to conversion. Indeed it must be so; for baptism and conversion coincided in the days when the Apostles wrote, and they expressed themselves accordingly.

My own impression would be that enough stress was not laid upon Confirmation. At present it is sadly lost in a mere form. What I should wish would be this. Instead of once in three years, all being collected and brought at once for confirmation, let the priest of each parish be empowered (the principle is already conceded) to admit at any time any applicant whom he may deem fit to the Holy Communion, and let there be a short and solemn service for each admission. Then every three years when the Bishop came round those who had been so admitted would be presented to him for confirmation. Confirmation might thus be made a solemn act; the sacrament (if I may so call it) of conversion as baptism is of regeneration. It should be looked upon as the deliberate completion of baptism, and not simply treated as a matter of course that every one who was baptized was to be confirmed.

But this is mere speculation which perhaps it would be wiser not to indulge in.

KNELLER HALL, *January 22, 1850.*

. . . Thanks for the quotation from Calvin, which I will own has completely surprised me. Nor can I see, I confess, how to work it into what is ordinarily called Calvinism.

I well remember your Lectures on the unpardonable sin. They were the first that ever gave me a glimmering of light upon the subject. I have often thought of the distinction you then mentioned between the Lutheran and the Calvinist: one saying only the regenerate could, the others that only the

regenerate could not, fall into it. The distinction is more verbal than appears at first sight, yet contains very much of the difference between the two doctrines.

I suppose you are correct in saying that the running of doctrine into details is a sort of necessity of our nature. It is one which I am very much disposed to fight against. Do you remember Aristotle's remark on a hand cut off from the body? It is a mere equivocate, he says, to call it a hand. All the powers and properties by which it was distinguished, it enjoyed by virtue of its union with the body, and that union ended it was no longer the same thing. Such, too, are religious doctrines. They depend always for their force, almost always even for their truth, upon the connexion in which they stand. These technical definitions tear them from that connexion and exhibit them unsupported. Baptismal regeneration is intelligible when taken in connexion with the totality to which it belongs; viz. the Church's teaching and influence, and other ordinances. But when the Sacrament is taken barely and nakedly, and the infant baptized is supposed to be taken among heathen before it can speak, I can only say that Baptism was not intended to be so torn away from the Church's system, and that I cannot tell what it may please God to do. The same appears to me to be the case with the doctrine of apostolical succession. It is true when applied to the Church as a whole, but was never intended to be split up into a number of threads by which each individual Priest could trace his right to act. Or, again, the Real Presence; it is true when taken of the Sacrament as a whole, including therein the Minister and the receiver, not true when assigned to the consecrated elements taken apart from the ordinance.

Soul-destroying and such other pleasant epithets will not, I fear, be got rid of very easily. There are a set of people whose consciences or sensitivities, or what not, will not let them burn their brethren, but who think themselves justified in taking it out in abuse. It is cutting off the heads of Hydra. I am content to be called a soul-destroyer, if so it must be, however much pain it gives me to hear it, rather than to run the smallest risk, now that we have lost the scholastic metaphysic, of binding ourselves with the scholastic fetters: the fetters were barely endurable with the metaphysic, without it they would choke us.

I think what with one letter and another I have given you somewhat more of a dose of my notions than it is fair to

call upon you to listen to. But I know you are interested in the subject as well as myself. Perhaps I may have more to say some day. But for the present I have done.

KNELLER HALL, *January 30, 1850.*

You will not surely deny that there is such a thing as what the Evangelicals call conversion. I have heard you teach it. I confess I would rather call it Confession. But it corresponds within to the *conscious* acceptance of the Gospel, and without to the public profession of it. This whether slow or sudden does make a vast difference in a man's life, while with your view it seems to me to be slurred.

KNELLER HALL, *January 31, 1850.*

In teaching children I fear I should fall under the head of those whom Gorham calls soul-destroyers. I should not hesitate to tell them that the very fullest measure of divine *grace* was theirs *as far as they could use it*. I should lead them to look forward to a growth, and not to such a paroxysm as the Methodists maintain to be necessary. *Within the Church* it seems to me that such paroxysms can only be right or needful when from some reason the proper growth has been checked.

But I object most strongly to expressions such as "sully the whiteness of their Baptismal robe"; as if the Baptism had really washed out the evil tempers and they had fallen back again without knowing it. I object most strongly to the idea that Newman so frequently tries to impress, that childhood, when we know not what we are doing, is a time of peculiar probation, and that we unconsciously make or mar our destiny by what we do then.

Such a view I consider essentially false.

I find no analogy for this action of Divine Grace like a magical incantation. The mystery of that Grace is that while it is above and beside our will it acts through our will. Our will may be called supernatural, for it is not subject to the ordinary laws of cause and effect. But Grace is doubly supernatural; for it bears the relation to our will similar to that which our will bears to matter.

The baptized infant *has* the grace in this sense: that if *told* of it, he can use it. But not in the sense that if he never hears of it, it will prompt him, restrain him, strengthen him, quite without his concurrence.

As to the decision to be given on this point I wish it to

be left as open as *possible*. Perhaps I do not think it as vital as you do; clearly I do not; because you would exclude Gorham from the Ministry and keep Wordsworth; while I would *quite* as readily exclude the latter as the former. But I would rather include both: even with the result of having two contrary doctrines put forth authoritatively. I am quite convinced that this is a matter where to secure a verbal agreement does not even tend to a real one. Why, the controversy dates from the Reformation; it will not be suddenly quenched now. The two parties have from the first divided the Church of England: and each has left its traces on our formularies. Those traces cannot be obliterated by a Privy Council decree.

In order to be quite honest, I ought to add that in teaching an unbaptized child I should lay much stress on the fact that he is born in a Christian country, and should consider that blessing of Providence as conferring *some* privileges analogous to Baptism. But I could not teach him that he had a positive title to Divine Grace.

I have given you two letters after I had thought I had done, but I should like you to understand me, and I should like very much to understand you.

In regard to my objection to words in the Baptismal Service, you will see that I do not say that they do not contain the truth, but that they do not convey the truth to their hearers, and that such words ought to be used as would do both. I should make the same objection exactly to the Athanasian Creed. But neither is a question which the mass of the English Clergy will discuss calmly; and I should not say openly what I say to you.

KNELLER HALL, *February 9, 1850.*

. . . The Gorham decision comes on Tuesday. I believe that it is now known that it will be in favour of Gorham, not on the merits but on some point of law; the three Episcopal assessors concurring. I think when I last wrote I expressed myself not quite fairly in comparing him with Wordsworth. For I admit that Wordsworth's view is reconcilable with our Liturgy, though hardly I think with our Articles. While Gorham's is reconcilable with nothing in our Church's system or teaching. If the Church asserts at all, she certainly does assert that baptized children are to be treated as having been received into God's favour, and not as aliens and children of wrath.

One word more about *putre- versus petri-faction*.¹ The thing is a quibble; but I meant something. It seems to me that a Church may die out either into Pharisees or into Publicans and Harlots. There is no question which death to outward sense appears more decent. But there is also, I apprehend, no question which leaves most hope of new life springing up where the old has perished. I really fear that had we lived in our Lord's time we should, if left to ourselves, have been sorely tempted to prefer the Pharisees. . . .

For myself, I trust we yet have a different destiny before us.

The correspondence on baptismal regeneration will fittingly be followed by two letters in regard to the Holy Communion. When compared with what is said in Archbishop Temple's Primary Visitation Charge, 1898, on "The Doctrine of the Eucharist," they show that the substance of his views with reference to this Sacrament also remains unchanged:—

To Mr. Scott

KNELLER HALL, April 26, 1852.

I will tell you as well as I can some of my notions, the best I have yet been able to get, on the passage in 1 Cor. xi. 20-34.

The idea of the Lord's Supper is founded, as the Apostle implies (x. 18), on the Jewish Peace Offering. It was in that offering that the worshippers eat of the sacrifices.

The idea of the Peace Offering as different from the other sacrifices appears to rest on the mysterious unity of animal life. An animal is distinguished from other existing things by unity which pervades all its parts and yet cannot be said to belong to any one. A stone may be broken into many stones. A plant may in many cases be divided into many plants. But an animal (I am speaking popularly, not scientifically) is destroyed by division, and a separated limb is a limb no longer.

This mysterious unity was used as a symbol to express a bond between man and man, and between man and God. Those who had eaten of one animal were, as it were, bound together by the secret tie which once bound together the parts of the animal. These parts incorporated in them seem to retain their mutual attraction and to make the eaters in some sense one flesh.

¹ *Supra*, p. 504.

Hence the sacredness of the hospitality which had been ratified by partaking of salt, the symbol of animal food.

To tear asunder such ties was something so much the more fearful and unnatural because the ties were invisible. Hence, too, the use of the same ceremony at the ratification of a covenant.

And in order to impress the notion more strongly, a mechanical unity was sometimes added to the physical by a procession of the covenant makers between the parts of the animal. The animal thus seemed to hold them, as well as to draw them, together.

The Peace Offering was one in which God and the offerer shared the sacrifice. At the bottom of the Peace Offering always lay the idea of a covenant.

And some sacrifices, such as the Passover, shared this idea though they were not strictly Peace Offerings. In the Passover there was a covenant made with God.

The great covenant in Exodus xxiv. (a very awful chapter) is ratified by Peace Offerings of the same kind, verses 5 and 11.

The "Blood of the Covenant" was an expression referring to the very same idea, and, though of course not distinct (clearly) in thought from the blood of sprinkling used in purifying or atoning, yet originally used to convey quite a different meaning. This blood still represented the unity, for the unity lay in the life and the life was in the blood. Here too "*half*" the blood was sprinkled on the altar," that a share might be given to God. In the Sin Offering the *whole* of the blood is given to God, for the blood is the atonement.

Now in the Lord's Supper the same idea is to be maintained, and because we are all partakers of one bread we are said to be one bread, and by being one bread we are one body.

The Lord's Supper is a Thank Offering or Eucharist, not a Burnt Offering or Sin Offering.

The Apostle, however, is well aware that this is but a symbol. The dead animal has not really a uniting power. It is dead, and the moment the life has left the unity has departed with it. The bread is still more a mere symbol, for it does not even possess the mysterious unity which an animal has.

An idol is nothing in the world, nor is that which is offered to an idol.

But that which is nothing *in itself*, yet when *so* eaten becomes the table of devils.

Is not the conclusion irresistible that the bread also is nothing in itself, but when *so* eaten becomes the communion of the Body of the Lord?

What, then, is the one body? Not the bread, but the bread *so* eaten, or the worshippers who have eaten it.

In other words, there seems to me to be an identification of three things: the Elements, the Congregation, the Lord. And if S. Paul had been asked whether the consecrated elements were, or contained, the Body of the Lord in *any* sense he would have repudiated such an expression. In the bread *so* eaten and in the communicants *so* eating there is the Body; but the elements themselves are "nothing in the world."

The Lord's Body, then, are not the elements, not the Congregation, but the Congregation communicating.

He who eateth and drinketh unworthily discerneth not that Body of the Lord to which he belongs. If when we did communicate we did so discern ourselves we should not be judged.

I do not know what you will say to this. But my view is neither High Church nor Low Church. I cannot find the Real Presence in the Elements nor in the Congregation, but in both together, though certainly, if we must choose, rather in the latter than in the former.

In conclusion, let me ask further what is your opinion as to this Supper. Was it not their ordinary meal? And was it not the peculiar privilege of quite the early Church thus to consecrate to God the most common occurrence of life? A privilege on which we trace in this chapter the first inroad? For when S. Paul desired any man who was too hungry to wait for the rest to eat at home, he already prepared the way for the time when no man would think of satisfying hunger on such an occasion. Were not S. Paul's words the probable occasion of separating the Agape from the Holy Communion, before not discriminated?

I hope you do not think I am as positive and dogmatic as I see both this Letter and the last *appear*. I have not time to put everything in a diffident form, and I have stated much positively which I only want your opinion on.

I have not Lachmann here; but I have a sort of recollection that he leaves out τοῦ Κυρίου in v. 29. Has he any authority? If he is right this makes for my view, I think. It seems to me impossible to resist the conclusion that if the Real Presence be in the Elements, *à pair* in the idolatrous feast there was a real presence of the Devils in the victims.

KNEILLER HALL, August 16, 1853.

I found in S. Augustine yesterday a passage which so nearly expresses my own idea of the Holy Communion that I cannot help sending it to you.

"Hoc est sacrificium Christianorum: *multi unum corpus in Christo*. Quod etiam Sacramento altaris fidelibus noto frequentat Ecclesia, ubi ei demonstratur, quod in ea re quam offert, ipsa offeratur."—*De Civitate Dei*, x. 6 *ad fin.*

The difference in attitude between the above letters and those of the Oxford days is marked. The tone is still modest, but a new firmness has come into it: the "materials out of which principles are made" are passing into principles themselves;¹ the mass has become solidified. The years brought further changes, and in one of the subsequent letters to Scott he writes:—

To Mr. Scott

KNEILLER HALL, April 19, 1854.

The pin will not scratch you much, and I will give you leave to laugh at my infallibility as much as you please while you write in your old tone of affection. That I shall like you better every year that I know you, past experience teaches me to be probable. That I shall change my mind as to my own reforming infallibility, I will acknowledge to be very possible. I have changed many opinions within the last ten years. I may change many more, and perhaps back again, within the next ten. And I see some of my philosophical friends change very marvellously. There is Shaïrp for instance, who once was so philosophical that no improvements could go far enough for him, and now resolves all doubts into the simple dictum, "It's all square in the end"; a singular effect of matrimony in his case. Your going to Oxford certainly will not keep me from it. Nor am I afraid of Mrs. Scott; indeed, I should have been much more so if you had not been elected than now that you have. My mother, I am thankful to say, is much better. God bless you, my dear Scott; if I have vexed you with my unsympathising politics, at any rate you know enough of human

¹ *Supra*, p. 490.

nature to see that mere congratulations would have been hollow from me, and would have separated us much more than the pin stuck in the cushion.

"I have changed many opinions within the last ten years. I may change many more, and perhaps back again, within the next ten;" but the subsequent changes were gradual, natural developments unaccompanied with any violent mental disturbance; but in the period between 1844 and 1854 the changes in some respects were radical. True—like many of the greatest changes—they had come without "observation." To a man like Frederick Temple Ordination must have meant much; but there is little reference to it, and no record of the things which happened in the mental history during these eventful years. Only at the latter date we seem to be looking out on a new world: he had secured his foundation, and he had begun with confidence to build upon it; he was master of himself. Especially noteworthy, as illustrating his change of attitude, are his remarks about a new school of dogmatics:—

February 9, 1850.

. . . I cannot help thinking that a dogmatic theology is yet to be looked for which will avoid both the difficulties (putrefaction and petrification).¹ I cannot help thinking that much of that will consist in distinct refusals to define; a dogmatism hitherto never practised by the Church. Much also, it seems to me, would consist in laying down broad *practical* rules *instead* of definitions. But these things are a long way off.

There is the same tone in his remarks with reference to the Athanasian Creed:—

Before August 13, 1852.

. . . I am most deeply convinced that the expressions in which Religious Faith and Religious Devotion are cast must

¹ *Supra*, p. 504.

vary from age to age if they are to be real. I am convinced, for instance, that we are not *now* justified in using the Athanasian Creed. I believe that the great body of the clergy agree with me. But in spite of that they would never remove it from our services. They would be afraid.

He writes with something of the censoriousness and assurance of a young man, and a tinge of that tone was perhaps apparent for several years. With the growing responsibilities and fuller experience of life came fuller charity in judging others; he was more willing himself "to refuse to define." He never lost the determination to hold the judgment in suspense on points of faith which were not clearly revealed.

The following letters, referring to his friends Stanley and Jowett as commentators, show that, along with a growing breadth of view, there still remained an appreciation of Christian dogmatics. It was this which differentiated him from them. That one so fully in agreement in many respects with the liberal school of theology should think otherwise on this subject seemed somewhat incomprehensible to them and to many others, and by Jowett especially it was taken as somewhat of a grievance. But no one had fully entered into Temple's mind who failed to see that belief in the objective side of Christian faith was of the essence of the man, and that he could not "but speak the things which" he had "seen and heard." With the mental superiority assumed by some members of the school, which refused to take seriously convictions that they did not share, he was quite out of sympathy.

To Mr. Scott

June 14, 1855.

I am disappointed with Stanley's *Corinthians*. It is really a defect in a divine to be totally unable to understand a doctrine. He can understand a fact, understand it well

enough even to make it, and what intelligence is equal to that required for creation? He can understand a precept. . . . But a doctrine goes beyond him.

July 11, 1855.

. . . The constructive mania in these days is much more mad than the destructive. That a man should rob us of the Septuagint is not half so insane as that he should profess to reveal it afresh. Donaldson's *Book of Jasher* is another specimen of about equal madness. Do you not think some one might now rewrite S. Paul? Not what he did say, but what he ought to have said; with our lights, you know—something in the style of Stanley's Paraphrase, but bolder.

October 30, 1855.

. . . I hope no storm will burst on his (Jowett's) book;¹ but if it does, I hope he will hold his peace and let his friends fight his battle for him. Silence is one of the greatest of virtues. And assuredly the more all turmoil is prevented and the more calmly all the difficult questions such a book necessarily raises are discussed, the better for all parties.

Three months later he returns to the subject of Jowett's book, the *Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*:—

8 ROYAL CRESCENT, NOTTING HILL,
January 5, 1856.

. . . I am rather disturbed by the sort of uneasy feeling which Jowett's book is occasioning; still more because I think that in some respects it is neither unnatural nor unfair. The essay on the Atonement, *read by my knowledge of him*, does not deserve what is said of it. But it still suffers from the fault which I found in the first draft of it (I did not see it after that till its publication), namely, that it is too negative. It is quite impossible to make people understand that when you object to the ordinary statement of a doctrine you do not object to the doctrine itself. I am uneasy because I think it much harder to set a misunderstanding of this kind right than to avoid it in the first instance; and he may get into much trouble. I hope,

¹ "Earlier Years" Memoir, vol. i. pp. 78, 79.

however, that a second edition will soon be called for, and that he will then be able to explain himself. At bottom the whole question turns upon this: Are we reconciled by being forgiven, or are we forgiven by being reconciled? The ordinary statement says the first; Jowett, the latter. I am quite sure that the great mass of Christians will be quite content if he will only say that he looks upon the power of our Lord's life and death as the one true source of our Redemption, and that they do not at all demand the additional statement (which he objects to make) that Eternal Justice demanded a victim. *Why* our Lord's life and death were the means used to redeem mankind he objects to say. I never met with any but ultra-evangelicals who, when pressed to the point, did not shrink as he does from the same statement. But he has thought much of their view, and states his objection strongly; he has not worked out his own view, and it is concluded (not unjustly) that he means to deny even the doctrine which they mean to express. I dare say I shall suffer a little in his company. I met a lady the other day who was very civil till I accidentally mentioned my intimacy with him, when she put on a surprised look and avoided all further conversation of any kind.

But Temple's creed was always that occasional mistaken expressions of doctrine were a necessary condition of a spirit of free inquiry, and were more loyal to truth than was unthinking orthodoxy. This conviction, which explains both his participation in *Essays and Reviews* and also his silence in many another controversy, is expressed in the two letters which follow :—

To Mr. Scott

8 ROYAL CRESCENT, NOTTING HILL, W.,
January 20, 1857.

. . . I do not like saying much of the Jowettian Lectures, as you may well imagine. But I am very, very sorry that you should have any annoyance or anxiety in the matter. I suppose all times of discussion are times of discomfort to serious young minds; but that kind of discomfort generally settles down at last. I can remember that when I was an

Undergraduate Tait's Lectures, and sometimes his Catechetics, used to distress and unsettle me excessively. I now look back at it with wonder; but it was real enough at the time. Probably, however, Tait's caution saved him from disturbing us so much as Jowett's philosophy may disturb the present Undergraduates. But to make the study of Divinity real and not in some degree unsettling appears to me simply impossible. The question always is whether the degree of unsettlement is expedient.

Our theology has been cast in the scholastic mode, *i.e.* all based on Logic. We are in need of and we are being gradually forced into a theology based on psychology. The transition, I fear, will not be without much pain; but nothing can prevent it. Nor do I see how some of the discussion can be kept out of the teaching even of Undergraduates. For it enters largely into what they have to learn.

God guide us right in the matter, and you especially who have so much to make you feel the weight.

NOTTING HILL, LONDON,
February 28, 1857.

. . . I am vexed that I said anything about Jowett. There is no doubt a considerable difference between you and me; but not what you have deduced from my Letter. I must have expressed myself very ill. The temptation to explain is strong on me; but if I have muddled the matter once I may do so again, and perhaps more. If we were talking together we should more easily understand one another. I will only say now that I do not quite agree that "mere doubts" are always an evil, nor that all destruction ought to be followed by construction. I think in many points the right change is not from error to truth, but from error to avowal of ignorance. And further, that even in those cases where "mere doubts" are an evil a Teacher often instils them *inevitably* and *unconsciously*, as Tait certainly did, as Newman did, and as all the Reformers in the sixteenth century did.

There was a lighter side to so grave a subject:—

KNELLER HALL, August 16, 1852.

. . . When I was in Worcestershire the other day, Robert Lawson went once to his clerical meeting. They are reading the Epistle to the Hebrews. One of the body rather sets up for a scholar. Robert Lawson had never been before, so that

he naturally kept silence. On his return he told that the scholar had enlightened all by his comments on μέτοχοι in iii. 1, which he informed them was a word in use at Athens and signified one who had some but not all the rights of a citizen, just our own case while we are still on earth, and not yet made perfect in heaven. The Attic word, he observed, had an extra ι in the middle, an insertion not unusual in the Attic dialect. As the learned body acquiesced in this comment on μέτοχοι, I thought it might come in well in the new Lexicon.

The correspondence with Scott includes letters on *Ecclesiastical* subjects as well as on dogma. The latter were occasioned, as has been noticed, by the Gorham controversy in 1850: the former were the result of the attempt two years later to revive Convocation. This subject naturally led to discussion on the relations of clergy to laity:—

To Mr. Scott

Before August 13, 1852.

. . . As to the Clergy and Laity question, provided you will rest your preference for the decision of the former on the ground of their greater study of the questions, I have no objection to make. This ground, however, admits all Laymen who have equally studied, excludes all Clergymen who have not studied or who have a natural incapacity for such studies.

Your comparison with earthly affairs will hardly hold. We do as a matter of fact entrust Legislation, the highest earthly matter, to men who have not studied. And we are very unwilling to confine it. Legislation by Lawyers would be anything but desirable. A Parliament of Lawyers would never have done even the little that has been done for Chancery and Common Law Reform. . . . There is a point at which study is mischievous. It often enlarges at first only to narrow at last. Common sense without learning is not a good guide, but learning without common sense is a positively bad one. I see only one way in which the two can correct each other. Let the man of learning convince the man of common sense. If he cannot, let him suspect his learning. . . .

There is one consideration more against putting too much into the hands of the clergy. They are men, and like all

bodies of men are sadly prone to give, without knowing it, some weight to considerations of expediency in deciding on questions of truth. It is impossible not to see that in the arguments on Apostolical Succession, Baptismal Regeneration, Justification by Faith, the clergy are often unconsciously influenced by one side or the other presenting the shortest path to the end (generally a very good end) which they have in view. On such questions I would rather have the unlearned common sense than the warped learning. . . . I am sure that the clergy look at doctrine in a "*practical*" way, not what is the best doctrine to practise but what is the best to preach. If I preach Liberty of Conscience I am told it is a dangerous doctrine. What on earth has that to do with it? The question is whether it be a true doctrine. So if I say that the Sabbath is abrogated and the observance of the Sunday is an ordinance of the Church. So if I say that the numbers in the Old Testament must not be insisted on. All men are liable to be misled by this feeling. But the clergy are liable to be misled by it in a particular direction, and all their decisions in that direction are to be suspected. I have given you a long screed. But as we are not disagreeing upon principles you will not be unwilling to see what has to be said on my side.

KNELLER HALL, *August 13, 1852.*

I do not like to discuss Convocation more, because I am afraid of vexing you. I should have said nothing about it perhaps. But I remember once in 1841 at Duloe, at a time when I was making my mind on those matters, I heard you say that you did not think we were fit for Convocation. It made a deep impression on me, because I thought it not the view you would naturally take, and therefore to be ascribed to some very strong reasons. . . . I do not believe Convocation in *any* sense represents our Church. I do not believe that the Clergy have any more right than the Laity to decide points of doctrine. . . .

I say all this because I made up my mind some time ago to be quite open with you on every subject that turned up between us. But I confess your Letter makes me feel that it will give you a good deal of pain, and perhaps lower your opinion of me.

KNELLER HALL, *September 1, 1852.*

. . . The question (of the relative position of clergy and laity) in reality runs very deep, and I must make my meaning plainer. What makes me believe? I cannot believe because

another man tells me, not even if he be an Apostle. . . . Belief, the evidence of things not seen, . . . is an inner conviction, bound up with life and conscience. . . . No man can delegate to another the responsibility of this belief. At any rate no man ought. But practically no man can. All this, I think, you will allow me. But here come two roads.

We must distinguish between the faith and the form in which it is expressed. No man can give up the responsibility of settling for himself his faith, but many maintain that the clergy ought to settle the form. Some say of right because they are divinely appointed. . . . I believe that no man can allow, or rather ought to allow, another to settle the form of his faith absolutely. He is bound to exercise his judgment upon it, and to use it as subordinate to his own conscience. So, too, I believe that no Church ought to allow any "body" but herself to settle the form of *her* faith. She may employ a body of men to propose such forms of faith, just as Parliament employs a body of lawyers to draw statutes, or a body of Cabinet ministers to propose reforms, but will delegate to neither the business of legislation. . . .

I am not the least afraid of a clerocracy or of clerical tyranny. I am not the least afraid that the clergy will be allowed to *settle* points of doctrine. I am afraid that they would *lessen* their power; lessen their power to *teach* by attempting to *decree*.¹ . . . I who love power and have to struggle against the feeling might and main, detect its presence rather more rapidly than you do. And your answer that what I say is an argument for anarchy will not hold. It is an argument for representative government. If persons may abuse power, then see that you never give power *finally* to any one. . . .

Forgive me, dear Scott, if in eagerness I write positively. Write back as or more positively. It makes everything clearer. And I quite understand your dogmatism and I believe you will understand mine. . . .

Let me put before you one thing more which I could not venture even for the sake of clearness to be positive about.

¹ The same general view is apparent in a letter to Canon Lyttelton, written after he became a Bishop (17th July 1874, House of Lords):—"You turn to the Ordination Office. 'But I find not a single word in that Office which implies that the Clergy are to legislate for the Church. They are to teach; but they are to teach according to the lines drawn for them by the Church, and not a syllable is said to imply that they are to draw those lines.'"

Our Lord (S. John xvi. 7) could not send the Comforter till He was gone away. For the full action of the Holy Spirit it was necessary that even He should go. While He remained His overpowering personal presence made the life of the Spirit in the heart impossible. The liberty essential to the working of the Holy Spirit was incompatible with even a Divine Authority present in the Flesh. Is there not some danger that the clergy by claiming a similar kind of authority may in their measure hinder the working of that Spirit?

No address and no date.

I am always very grateful to have humility and a childlike temper strongly brought to my notice. I am quite aware that my views and opinions do not directly tend to humility in the sense that yours do. It is unquestionably easier to be childlike if you put yourself in the position of a child than if you take that of a man. It is the easier path to humility, and those who are not permitted by conscience to take it must be glad of anything which warns them of their danger. But the easier path is not always the right one. To be converted and become as little children is one precept, and in malice to be children but in understanding men is another. The danger on your side is to persuade yourself that you believe when you really don't; to stifle doubts which ought to be fairly met; to prefer Christianity to Truth, which of course always means preferring the traditional interpretation of Christianity to the true one. And these are real dangers. For I am certain that men do sometimes delude themselves into believing that they believe.

Nor is my view in its very extremest form incompatible with reverence for authority and a childlike temper. Imagine a church in which all the officers and teachers shall be elected by and out of the body for a definite time, re-eligible after that time but not necessarily re-elected. Do not suppose, however, that this is my ideal of a church. I have the deepest conviction of the power of the past over the present. And the Apostolic Succession has been a means of binding all the history of the Church into one, the efficacy of which has been rendered only the more marked by the instances of those who have tried to do without it.¹ Conservatism is essential, the very first essential, to life; and the great conservative element in the Church, has been the

¹ "Exeter" Memoir, vol. i. p. 389.

Apostolical Succession. But valuable as this electric chain is by which the virtue of past ages seems to thrill us now, yet we must not let it fetter our limbs, still less strangle us altogether. And that, I confess, seems to me the tendency of your views. The difference between legislation and interpretation is after all only another name for the whole difference between us. I should not like to leave lawyers to extract principles out of decisions and apply them to new cases to the extent that you would. The two in reality differ only in degree. I suppose I need hardly say that your view on this point seems to me very strange.

The question of Church government raised in these letters naturally runs up into a doctrinal question, and the vehemence which he throws into the discussion as against clerical monopoly is due in part to the reaction in his own mind from the opposite influences of the Oxford Movement which had worked so strongly in him ten years previously. The subject of the participation of the laity in doctrinal decisions is still (1905) under discussion. To the last Dr. Temple would have maintained that ultimately responsibility for the safe-keeping and the right rule of the Faith rests with the whole Body of the Church collectively (lay as well as clerical), and, moreover, that as doctrinal decisions are not merely expressions of abstract truth, but legislative acts which affect the life of the laity, the laity ought to have a consentient voice before they are made operative upon them. He was always in favour of a lay house as supplemental to the clerical Convocations, and amongst the last activities of his public life was an endeavour gradually to give the lay house a fuller and more organised participation in the government of the Church.¹ Of special permanent value is his insistence on the principle that the clergy are to be regarded as instructors and not promulgators of edicts. "I am afraid that the clergy would *lessen*

¹ *Infra*, pp. 666-669.

their power ; lessen their power to *teach* by attempting to *decree*."

The view expressed in the letters, that a special value of the apostolical succession consists in the conservative element which it brings to the life of the Church, is that which he maintained to the end.¹

The same topics of doctrinal and ecclesiastical interest contained in the correspondence with Dr. Scott are found in the letters to Robert Lawson, most of which belong to this period. It is interesting to notice the difference in tone between the two correspondences. In writing to Dr. Scott he writes as the junior to the senior ; in writing to Robert Lawson the positions are reversed : there is always about the letters something of the freemasonry of the schoolboy friendship. The letters are full, and fresh, and free from all reserve ; none so light or gay in some places, and none so full an outpouring of the heart in others. In 1846 both friends had lately been ordained. Temple was gaining some experience of pastoral work at Duloe and elsewhere ; Lawson had accepted a curacy in Devon from Leopold Acland, son of Sir Thomas, in the parish of Broadclyst near Exeter. The letters begin with pleasant chats on such topics as come up in close personal friendships, and on the new experiences of clerical life, with advice thereon from Temple :—

To Robert Lawson

—, July 10, 1846.

. . . I am glad you like Acland : I can quite believe him a very likeable person, and I have no doubt a more conscientious, earnest man to work with you would not find. By this time I suppose you have seen something of your parish. I do not wonder at your complaint that the books you read have clashed with your previous notions about visiting, etc. ; partly because all "previous notions" *must* be rather impracticable, and partly because every book I have met with seems to me to recommend a totally different system from

¹ *Supra*, "London" Memoir, p. 10.

every other. But do you not think that in this, evidently the most discretionary part of a clergyman's duty, the best plan is to have no system to begin with, but to let one grow up of itself as one's experience increases? I am sure that no one person can lay down rules for any other, or do more than give the merest suggestions in such a matter, because the real value of such ministrations must depend so entirely upon their thorough earnestness both of manner and of matter, and that can never be secured unless the method pursued is one quite natural to the user. . . .

Here, of course, one can do nothing but go about from one 'lion' to another and admire the perfection of order and discipline in which the parish is kept. But I rather feel a sort of fear of such orderly parishes; all is so smooth that one cannot tell what may be festering beneath. However, things are very delectable here to the clerical eye: the squire and the vicar in thorough harmony; the Church as full as it can hold; the school in most admirable condition. . . .

I shall be glad to be at work again; especially as these good people, though very good-humoured and cheerful, are very sensible and can neither be made to laugh nor to cry. I think if I stayed here long I should be turned into a sort of happy vegetable, a smiling, good-humoured, broad-faced cabbage, or a great red apple! or something of that sort.

DULOE, *July 24, 1846.*

. . . I shall preach a little this time just by way of carrying on the controversy about drawing lots. This, then, I will allow you, that a religious mind in full faith in the special providence of God will always think that what happens in the course of things is intended for his special consideration at that very time. . . . But I will not allow more than this. . . . How I hate the common-sense kind of life, you know very well; and yet I really think at times that it is less dangerous than the other extreme. I should not venture to say so positively, for I know how wrong it is to chill warm feelings by cold rationality. And yet such men seem often to me more solid material than those who allow themselves to be perpetually on the watch for slight circumstances and tokens. That tendency to dwell on those little things seems to me often to weaken the character, and certainly rather encourages a dreamy disposition.

. . . I have been thinking very much of your future plans.

I must say I cannot see that you will gain much by taking town work. I doubt whether it can be so different from country work as to compensate for the loss of spending so much time in making beginnings. . . . I cannot really think it would be best for you to change if you can stay where you are. If you are going abroad that is a different thing. I would hardly, I think, let any curacy come in my way, if I had a good opportunity of doing that; but you will surely learn more by working well in one place, than by seeing a variety at the cost of all that you see being but the surface. . . . Going abroad, however, is what will not often perhaps be within your power. It strengthens and opens a man's mind, and I think very few things at your time of life can be put in competition with it as a means of self-education. I have given you my opinion, you see, in my usual, I am sometimes afraid, rather dogmatical way.

DULOE, *August 13, 1846.*

. . . With regard to the Irishman, I should, if it were my own case, tell him plainly that I thought his Church in error and that his Church thought the same of mine, but that as he was dangerously ill it was not now the time to discuss such points, and that what I should say to him would be such as no Christian would object to, and the prayers I should use such as no Christian would refuse to join in; and of course in conversation with him I should do my best to lead him to think of his past life and to remember his sins, and put his trust in the Saviour. . . . I think Acland is right in saying that he ought to be told; it would not be right, I think, to let him think you were one of his own priests, nor right to your own Church to allow him to think you a layman. But to argue with him would be madness, and to talk controversially without arguing would be worse. . . .

The passages in the Acts are very remarkable; but yet is it not clear that the very fact that has struck you, the giving of the Holy Spirit before baptism, also struck the Church, and was considered quite an extraordinary fact? As an *argument* it tells quite against the Low Church people; for it evidently was a rare instance. But it is also a warning that though God has appointed ordinary means of grace, we have no business whatever to say that He will not dispense with them, even when we can see no reason for it.

I cannot see why I, who hold the Church to be invested with power from above, and that her officers have their

authority from her, may not recognise the degrees of power which she confers, as well as you who trace the same difference back to the Apostles by a regular succession. . . .

It is always very difficult to draw the line about forms, and one can only speak of tendencies. . . . But I was speaking of clinging to forms when society had cast them off; trying to clothe a whole Church in garments she has laid aside, or to dress her out after one's own fashion—the following of forms as such; not the use of them merely. In the case you put of a man praying and sinning every day I think you misunderstood me; surely we, even the very best of us, pray and sin every day. But if a man were to confess to me that he prayed with an intention in his heart to commit sin, and that he did not struggle with that intention, but even while praying, quietly allowed it to rest on his mind, I should tell him he was committing fearful idolatry. . . . And this temper, I think, gradually creeps into a body of men who keep up forms whose life is departed. But with individuals it is only in extreme cases that it can go this length; yet as is the case, I suppose, with all sins, we often make very fearful approaches to them at times.

DULOE, *August 21, 1846.*

. . . The young man who laments the coldness of his own heart touches one very deeply. How often a real advance in real religious life is accompanied by pain instead of pleasure, by a strengthening of remorse and fear instead of confirmed hope! It makes one feel ashamed of one's own more comfortable state of mind, and it is hardly possible not to tremble, lest it be but owing to a want of a lively conscience that one is not in the same condition. Of course such despondency is not right, it is a disease; but it is so often the disease of a very earnest and religious mind, that one is almost tempted to long for such a temper, disease and all. . . . I should lead him away as much as I could from the subject of his own coldness of heart, and rather try to fix his mind upon the love of our Lord towards us. That feeling of absence of sorrow or hatred for sin is in itself only physical; it *may* be a sign of evil; but in his case I should doubt it. We shall not be judged by our feelings, that is certain; and his will seems in the right bent, though he is perhaps weak of purpose. I should think very earnest prayers, more especially on the subject of our Lord's Passion, would be the greatest help to such a sufferer.

I am very sorry to hear what you say of —. I cannot myself see the uncertainty that is settling round historical points; it seems to me, on the contrary, that every day we are getting nearer and nearer to a certainty on such points quite unattainable before. As to the particular matter of the Middle Ages knowing nothing of Scripture, I am quite astonished to hear it doubted nowadays that they did know the Scriptures remarkably well, and could quote them in a way that not one clergyman in fifty could do now. I do not quite understand what he means; the great men, such as S. Bernard, S. Thomas Aquinas, Scotus Erigena, I suppose, he cannot possibly suspect of not being most accurately acquainted with them; the majority of the clergy, I should think, knew the Bible in Latin very fairly, the Psalms and Gospels almost by heart, the Psalms quite, for they generally chanted them as they travelled; and though there must have been very many ignorant priests who knew little beyond how to read their breviary, we must remember that, though we have not many so bad as that, our clergy are a much smaller set than theirs. The people certainly did not know the Bible nearly so well as ours do; not at all in fact, except the very highly educated. This is our great gain, and one I would not change for all you can put on the other side; but I am surprised at any one's thinking now that the Church of the Middle Ages did not believe her system to be founded on the Bible, and did not perpetually appeal to the Bible to confirm every doctrine she advanced. The *Summa Theologiæ* of Aquinas is full of quotations from every part of the Bible, and S. Bernard often writes sentence after sentence of quotations; and the *Summa* has been a perpetual study ever since in the Roman Church. As to the large party who are only waiting (waiting!) to have this point established, it puts me in mind of the resolution of the Jews in Germany last summer, that if the Messiah did not come within a year they would wait for him no longer. Forgive the comparison; but it is enough to vex one to see how people play at battledore and shuttlecock with such matters, allowing themselves to be swayed backwards and forwards in so awful a decision by such argumentative trifling.

Very soon the letters enter more fully into doctrinal questions:—

DULOE, *August* 10, 1846.

I have been thinking much of what you say about making the Bible too familiar, and I think there is some danger in it. . . . I will not deny there is danger, and very serious danger, more serious than I had thought at first, in insisting on men's relinquishing the associations which are their support, and depending solely on their own conscience and its pure law.

On the other hand, there is very great danger of our making the Bible anything we please when we refuse to think of the writers of it such as they really were. The day is past when commentaries could be written as the Fathers wrote them; making each text a sort of motto to which all profitable doctrine which the imagination could suggest might be appended. . . . It is true that Eusebius, perhaps, and his contemporaries had far more materials than we have for determining many points which we wish to settle; yet I am sure that we can settle them better than he, for we know how to use our materials for such a purpose and he did not. This seems a bold thing to say, being in fact in the very teeth of the ordinary High Church argument; but the more I look into the Fathers the more I am convinced of it, because I see quite plainly that they never thought of looking at such questions in a critical light at all. You must remember at the same time that I am quite as much opposed to the Low Church argument which says that every man may make out the meaning of the Bible for himself. I still believe the Church (*i.e.* the body of the Faithful) must settle the question; which she will do by means of the services of those who study such points and ratify by the approving voice of her own sure spirit.

With regard to the doing away with forms from which the life is gone. . . . I do really think there is far more hope for the publican and sinner, sunk in the bustle of the world and the love of debasing lusts, than for the Pharisee with one eye turned upwards and the other down till Heaven itself seems to him but a reflex of the vilest parts of Earth. I think the separation of morality from religion the most fearful idolatry that man can fall into. . . . Such forms do not become "a channet of communication" to heavenly things; the telescope whose glass has been starred by a severe jar mars and distorts the view which the naked eye, though it sees less vividly, can see more truly.

DULOE, *August 13, 1846.*

Your position is undeniable, and I will grant you all that you say and perhaps even more than you would be willing to allow. So dangerous do I think the idoloclastic temper, so very unsafe a venture to drag up tares whenever you see them without thinking of the wheat that may be growing up with them, that I should even feel a great shrinking from attempting to convert a Dissenter who had been born and bred in his error, lest in rooting out his false views I should root out true ones at the same time. It is certainly a most dangerous thing to be rooting up prejudices, and in a case where, for the individual himself, the prejudices are harmless, it seems wanton playing with men's souls. But we must consider others as well; and, on the whole, I fear the shutting-your-eyes theory will not do. You have to choose between driving many a man of science who may be weak in faith into downright infidelity, and giving a serious shock to ordinary Christians who are much more valuable perhaps than the men of science, but, in proportion as they are so, are better able to bear the shock; and if you prefer the former you have the comfort of thinking that in twenty or thirty years the sure march of science is certain to turn your position, and the mischief you hazarded will have been done, and that which you wished to avoid will have become inevitable. Surely the best temper is quietly to watch all these movements in the philosophical world and not to trouble one's self with forming an opinion upon their doings: it is impossible to understand them without understanding them thoroughly, and we shall only be perpetually misjudging them. And meanwhile we may by opposing them be hindering the truth, laying a burden upon men's consciences which God did not intend, and, who knows? perhaps in our anxious care for those who are unlearned keeping from them what is for their good. I felt inclined to grumble at your letter because you seemed to me hardly charitable; and I am quite sure too if you had had time to think more upon the point you would not have said some things that you did; I know you do not really maintain the simple-swallowing theory, and yet that is what it would end in. Now you must not be vexed with me for saying this; I was rather angry with myself for having said I wanted to grumble, but when you asked why, I have told you, lest you might be imagining all kinds of things. I am quite sure the *most* charitable view we can take of everything and everybody is nearest the truth; the

most charitable we can take consistent with a rational account of the facts, not of course any wild theory which may pop into one's head for the purpose. And the plan of closing up investigations on account of their danger is applicable to individuals but not to society. You may be often called upon to advise men, who are shaking their own faith without reason, to abstain from such folly; I would join with you in the heartiest indignation against such vain trifling. But to speak against it in the abstract, to advise, not individual men whose case may in some way or other be put into your hands, but society in general, to leave off such pursuits, to attempt to turn the general current of opinion against them, is certainly useless—and to me seems worse. If there be danger in such investigations, the danger will be best averted by those who do their best either by their own study or by their influence upon the general tone of thinking to draw out from them and bring into clear light whatever there is in them true and good; if that be really done we need not fear the dangers. Controversialists as such, those who simply attack, and do not study with the firm conviction that nothing but an admixture of truth could have drawn men into error, and with the earnest desire to reach that truth and separate it from the falsehood, are never successful, and, I think, always mischievous: surely it is the duty of every man by his mode of thinking and talking to help on that conviction and to strengthen that desire.

A few years later, when Temple is at Kneller Hall and his friend has removed to the Diocese of Worcester, which was his permanent home, he is writing about the Gorham controversy:—

KNELLER HALL, *April 15, 1850.*

. . . Have you read the Bishop of Exeter's letter to the Archbishop? . . . The bringing the Nicene Creed into the controversy is very clever—as clever as it is unfounded. The phrase Original sin was unknown to the Fathers of Nicæa, and the notion so far from being brought into consciousness at that date that they *could* not have meant what is now ascribed to them. They meant that in baptism the covenant was sealed whereby all sins committed either before or after baptism were to be remitted. It is by virtue of that baptism which made us members of Christ that our sins are forgiven on repentance throughout life. This is the force of

the "one," for baptism is not to be repeated. Have you any Ruridecanal meetings, etc., about you, or what line is the Diocese of Worcester taking?

But before this time it had become evident that the doctrinal views of the two friends were diverging, and it is evident that as religious tendencies of an opposite kind caused some anxiety a few years before in the home circle, so Temple's liberal developments were an increasing trouble to some of his friends:—

November 30, 1847.

MY DEAREST ROBERT— . . . Your letter has made me feel very sad. If your sympathy should be taken from me I hardly know how I should get on. Not that I doubt at all your willingness to make allowances for me; but yet to find that what I was doing and what I was trying to do was what you could not desire to succeed would be inexpressibly painful to me. Yet even that we must bear, I suppose, if it be laid upon us; I say we, for whether or not you feel the pain of differing as acutely as I do, I cannot suppose you not to feel it at all. At the same time I comfort myself with remembering my own awkwardness of expression when arguing, which has so often called forth rebukes from you, simply because I had not expressed myself so as to be clearly understood. I really believe that we agree practically much more than you think; I really believe if you had a living you would find no discomfort in having me for a curate, nor would in any way disapprove of my teaching. I may have changed within the last four years, I must have changed much. But it is the complexion, not the substance of my opinions that has changed; a case which is more common in such changes than people usually suppose. . . . But I do not think the bent of my opinions has changed within the last four years. . . . And as for my views now I cannot undertake to compare them with those of Hampden; for I see plainly that Hampden did not clearly understand himself. He published his Bampton Lectures and was attacked for them. . . He soon began to see that his position was untenable, and yet could not retract what he had said, for he felt that it contained a truth which he knew not how to state in other words. So

he republished the Lectures with an Introduction flatly contradicting the very principles in the Lectures. . . .

I do not wish to draw you into an argument, nor do I desire to urge you to look into books you had rather not see. It was not with any controversial object that I offered to send you Stanley's Sermons, but simply because I thought they would interest you. What my ideas are upon the question of difference of doctrine, you will easily see from the sermon you have of mine upon "The Truth shall make you free."

I entreat you not to judge of me by such vague tests as my saying that I thought the difference between ourselves and the Dissenters one of tone, without at least trying to represent to your mind clearly and distinctly wherein you differ in doctrine from the Dissenters, and seeing whether, after all, you think so very differently from me. But if we must differ so much as for you to look with regret at my success and pleasure at my failures,¹ I must comfort myself with thinking that I shall surely remain the same to you personally. God bless you!—Ever dearest Robert, your most affectionate,

F. TEMPLE.

December 27, 1847.

MY DEAR ROBERT— . . . I am sorry my pro-Hampden signature has offended Jelf. It has, I am sorry to say, offended many whom I would give much never to offend; Scott for instance. But I cannot say I retract it or wish it undone. Good-bye.—Ever your most affectionate,

F. TEMPLE.

It was a refreshment doubtless to revisit old haunts, though the following visit might have had a sad enough ending :—

CREDITON, January 14, 1851.

. . . I came here on Saturday. Yesterday I rode to Culmstock, passing among other places by Trinity and Trinity Common. It was not in my way, but I could not resist. And I looked over the jolly view from the top of the hill and wished you were with me. I got to Culmstock safe, did my business and started homewards

¹ The preliminary offer of appointment to Kneller Hall was made in 1847.

about five. All went right till about a mile from here, when my steed, going only a butter and eggs trot, thought fit to step on a rolling stone. Nothing could save him. Down we came, and I was tossed in a graceful curve after the fashion of a bather taking a header. My hat touched the road first, and by being crushed to pieces saved me, I suppose, from worse consequences. Then my forehead, nose, cheek, and mouth received their share; and I thought for the moment that the left half of my face was sliced off. I lay for a second half stunned—so much stunned indeed that after the first concussion I felt no pain till I got up. Somehow an old tumble of mine in Wales, which I do not know that I ever told you of, came into my head at that moment and I groaned out, Oh, Humpty Dumpty, and then laughed. But when I tried to get up I found it was no such fun. After twice fainting I contrived to remount and get home more dead than alive. I put my feet in hot water and went to bed, and was not a little surprised to awake this morning and to find nothing the matter with me except the ruin of my beauty—no great loss perhaps, you will think; but indeed for the present I am a frightful object, so that you see I am not selfish, it is for the sake of those who look at me. However, I shall no doubt be all right in a little time.

Anxiety did not quench affection and the sense of fun—nor yet his old love of flowers:—

KNELLER HALL, *April 15, 1850.*

Many thanks for reminding me of one of the jolliest days in my life. I am a sad hand at remembering anniversaries, for my associations are always with places not with times. But I like to be told of them. I was very remiss in not remembering your birthday. By a painful effort I kept it in mind and determined to write to you on that day, and then forgot all about it when the time came. I am sitting examining six additional applicants for admission. Some of them very nice-looking fellows. One chap with a green coat, blue glass buttons, green trousers and blue stripe down the leg, long hair much oiled and brushed, and such a tie! Him, if the powers permit, I destine for plucking. But I will not judge in a hurry. . . .

We have many flowers here, but no cowslips. Or, at any rate, I have not yet seen any signs of them. They could hardly be in bloom even if we had them. But I think I should

have observed the plants. Snowdrops, primroses, periwinkles, daffodils we have wild and in great abundance.

II. EDUCATION

The same progressive tendencies in Temple's views on doctrinal and ecclesiastical subjects after he left Oxford mark his line in regard to the University and education generally. The influences and surroundings of his graduate days made him an ardent advocate of *University Reform*. Mr. Scott, with the natural feeling of a scholar, was likewise anxious for the improvement of the University as a seat of learning and education; but the anxiety was limited by his conservative instincts, and, notwithstanding his strong personal regard, Temple regretted, on public grounds, the election of his friend to the Mastership of Balliol. He was himself, as well as Jowett, a possible choice. He writes the following frank letter to his friend after the election :—

KNEILLER HALL, *April 5, 1854.*

Why are you not an unmitigated reformer that I might feel unmitigated pleasure in your election to the post that you most wished to have? Or why did it happen just now when, of all other times, we who are anxious to reform Oxford feel that our labours are in the crisis? I know you will not be angry, though perhaps you will be a little vexed, if I say openly just what I have been feeling, and you are so happy just now that the vexation will be a small matter. I could not help wishing just now for some thorough-going reformer, because I honestly believe the present Bill to be a poor thing unless worked *as far as it can be made to go* in that direction. It is the natural place for Balliol to be at the head of the movement. But, alas! you do not take that view, and will leave our laurels to Pembroke. I know that in the class list and in discipline the College will not go down in your hands. But my Oxford politics! alas! alas! Do not be cross at my lamentations. I am really interested so earnestly in the destinies of Alma Mater that

I cannot help wishing her to follow the path which I believe to be best. And do not think either that I am not sincerely glad for your own personal happiness. I am sure you cannot doubt my affection now. God bless you in the work! You will have my hearty prayers for your success in it.—Your most affectionate,
F. TEMPLE.

Do not suppose that I wanted the place for myself, though I would have taken it if offered. My own wishes for it were very weak.

The difference of view did not interfere with mutual confidences on the subject of University Reform, and, indeed, in many of the points at issue he had his friend with him. The first University Commission was appointed in 1854. Temple watched its proceedings with constant interest. The subject had been in the air for more than fifteen years, and before the Commission was formed many projects were afloat. In December 1852 Temple writes:—

December 28, 1852.

. . . I *hear* of active movements of various kinds at Oxford: halls to be set up by the tutors; exhibitions to be founded, etc. All this, however, will not open the Fellowships. Now I know you will be inclined to tear up this letter for that last sentence. But I do really rejoice to see the old place bettering herself. Oxford is worth many Cambridges yet.

He was never in favour of limiting the free-play of the competitive system by restricting scholarships to the children of poor parents, as appears from the following extract from a letter to one of his Rugby masters:—

July 26, 1863.

. . . With regard to — and our Scholarships, if you see him will you tell him that we wish to have as large a competition for our Scholarships as possible, and that poverty has nothing to do with them? I shall always be glad if a poor boy gets one, but not if he gets it by a cleverer rich boy not standing. If once the world gets the notion that

they are given not for brains and industry but for poverty, the whole plan becomes useless.

But mindful of his own early needs, he had always a special interest in promoting a good system of assisting the education of such poor students as were intellectually capable of benefiting by it. A previous Memoir¹ contains a letter written to Dr. Scott on this subject. The letter was called forth by the beginnings of the non-collegiate movement, and by proposals for establishing colleges, such as Keble College, worked on economical principles; but its main suggestion is the formation of a Students' Aid Society, dependent not upon endowments, but annual subscriptions. The suggestion is much after his special method—bold, unconventional, and placing hope of success more upon personal action than machinery. The following letter has that special touch of antipathy to the old Hebdomadal Board which was never altogether absent from those who had taken part in the Newmanite controversy. There is a germ in the letter of the grim humour of later days:—

KNELLER HALL, *October 11, 1854.*

I really am sometimes perplexed whether to protest most against the wanton cruelty of your temper, or against the abominable hypocrisy with which you cloke it. You know perfectly well that the first business of the new Hebdomadal Council will be to get rid of the old routine. I grant there is no means of killing it so effectual as having in some of its representatives and trampling on it in their persons. Perhaps, too, the justice of high Heaven 'really demands that the extinction of the old humbug should not be unconscious and painless, but that a victim or two should suffer the tortures of its execution. And therefore, painful as it must be to common human feelings, and glad as I am that I am not to have a part in it, I cannot, if you press me, deny that one or two representatives of the old system may with justice be

¹ "Education Office" Memoir, vol. i. pp. 118, 119.

singled out and elected into the new Board for the purpose of a solemn immolation. But really two would be enough. And how your desire of vengeance should have risen to such a height of passion as to make you unwilling to be satisfied with a less number than six writhing victims broken on the wheel, I cannot conceive. You have, to be sure, the palliation of having sat upon the old Board for a few months, and I can make some allowance for your sense being much keener than mine of the abominations only now to be abolished. But still, Scott—six! I really think six too many. Be merciful. A merciful man is merciful to his beasts, and surely we may stretch a point in such a case and include the old Heads under the beasts. . . .

There now, have I talked to you “as I used to do.” But without joke, I seriously think your policy mistaken. You will have a Hebdomadal Council of two antagonistic elements with nothing to fuse them, and the machine will come to mischief from the strain of the parts. And these routines are *never* worth more than a week’s knowledge of them.

He scents from afar the prospects of yet wider reforms :—

KNEILLER HALL, *October 30, 1855.*

. . . I am glad that Walter has commenced the arcaniora of Latin learning. How long will verses remain a part of Classical Scholarship? The new Provost of Queen’s some years ago would not join an incipient agitation for University Reform because we declined to advocate the total abolition of Greek and Latin. Oxford is yet a long way from *that*; but I doubt much whether we shall long be able to maintain our *present* methods.

Here also may be noted his view as to the age-graduation of scholarships. Writing to Dr. Scott some years later he says :—

EXETER, *June 2, 1870.*

. . . With regard to school scholarships I do not think that you get a satisfactory competition between boys of fourteen and boys of sixteen. The growth is so rapid just at that point that two years take the intellects to a different plane, as it were, where comparison is fallacious. I should prefer instituting several grades of scholarship; so many

scholarships for boys under fourteen, so many for boys between fourteen and sixteen, so many for boys between sixteen and seventeen. Within these limits a sliding scale of marks is possible. At Rugby we added 2 per cent per month for every month a boy was under the maximum age, and we found this work well.¹ I should not allow boys to hold these scholarships after they had left school.

Though Temple was not now in official connexion with the University, Scott consulted him on many points. Temple was not afraid of bold proposals, as the suggestion to allow an option between classics and mathematics in the Moderation School shows. This suggestion, as well as that in regard to the History School, is an illustration of his way of going to the root of a question and of looking far ahead:—

¹ The same view is expressed in a letter called forth by an inquiry of Mr. Acland twelve years later:—

“MY DEAR SIR—The question whether (A) or (B) should be elected to the Dyke Scholarship entirely turns on the further question whether age is to be taken into account. (A) has beaten (B), but not by very much. But there can be no doubt that (B) is the abler boy, and two years hence when he is as old as (A) is now, he will stand far higher than (A) does now. The Governors ought, in my opinion, to decide the general question whether they will consider age or not, and make their decision a binding precedent, and then let that decision govern the present case. My own opinion has always been in favour of taking age into consideration. The quality of brain which profits best by Academical training generally shows itself early. The brain which develops later is very often quite as valuable for purposes of life, but it does not get as much good (I do not say it does not get good and much good, but not *as* much good) from the discipline and cultivation specially given by a University. If you are to pick out boys who could not otherwise go there, and send them to Oxford or Cambridge, it is better worth while to choose those who show young. On the other hand, to let in Age lets in an element of uncertainty. How much is age to count? Some rules should be made, and they will be but rough rules at the best. At Rugby we added 2 per cent per month to the marks for juniority, and this worked well.

“It would be tolerably accurate, I believe, to put every boy three places higher for every year that he was junior, and I should not hesitate to put (B) five places above (A), that is, six places above his own place, on the score of his being two years younger.—Yours faithfully,

“F. Exon.

“R. Bere, Esq.”

8 ROYAL CRESCENT, NOTTING HILL,
January 16, 1857.

. . . To the actual matter of the first examination I have no objection. I wish much that you could divide it into two schools, one Latin and Greek, the other Mathematics, and allow a man to *pass* in either. By that means you would secure a certain amount of real discipline (for no one questions the discipline of Mathematics though that of French and German be ever so doubtful) and yet let in a new generation of minds.

8 ROYAL CRESCENT, NOTTING HILL,
January 20, 1857.

. . . The thing that I think needs your careful consideration is the History School. Modern History will do well enough for the pass. But for a class you ought to have History from the beginning. I do not mean that stress should be laid upon a man's being able to construe all the hard places in Thucydides, but he should know enough Latin and Greek to read both Thucydides and Tacitus with tolerable ease, and should certainly be master of their contents. Of course if a man is going to take up History for his final school he will give a historical turn to his examination for moderations: so that to require him to know Ancient History will not be all additional labour imposed on him!

Immediately after he had left Kneller Hall the era of competitive examinations began. Temple was appointed (chiefly, he thinks, through the influence of Macaulay¹) one of the examiners for the Indian Civil Service Examinations. He was not mistaken in his view that a big thing had been started which would affect the University greatly, and he honours it with one of his shrewd and pithy sentences:—

* KNELLER HALL, *December 27, 1854.*

. . . Are you going to make immediate preparations to secure a large share of the Indian appointments for Balliol? I expect that this opening will seriously affect the University. But I have a great deal of belief in the possibility of growing brains at demand. *You cannot grow genius, but you can grow talent.*

¹ Letter to Dr. Scott, June 14, 1855.

Of all his efforts, however, subsidiary and supplemental to the official work in the Council Office and at Kneller Hall, the most important was the large share which he took in starting the *Oxford and Cambridge Local Examinations*. This matter has been already treated in the Education Office Memoir;¹ but Mr. Scott was his main helper amongst the Oxford residents in carrying the scheme through, and the copious correspondence with him on the subject, which continued for several years, throws interesting side-lights, and adds much evidence on the beginnings of a great undertaking. The first of the letters brings Mr. Acland on the scene, the son of Sir Thomas Acland, to whose support Temple had been largely indebted for his Blundell's scholarship. Mr. Acland was his chief partner in inaugurating the movement. At the time (1857) the Temple family were residing in a house in Notting Hill. Hither came Acland, sent by Lingen, to consult Temple about a plan in his head for improving middle school education by examinations; and here—as it interested Dr. Temple in after days to relate—in his little study the scheme which was afterwards developed into the local examination movement was first mooted:—

8 ROYAL CRESCENT, NOTTING HILL, LONDON, W.,
February 25, 1857.

MY DEAR SCOTT—I have a scheme in my head which I want you to think about and write to me about when you have leisure, but not to talk about yet. I do not know whether you know that last year the Society of Arts commenced a system of examinations for the members of Mechanics' Institutes, and I was one of the examiners. It went off very well; we had a good many candidates; and a few acquitted themselves well or better than well.

This year the whole thing has swollen into gigantic

¹ See "Education Office" Memoir, vol. i. pp. 129-132.

proportions, and if we determined to admit them, we should have several thousands to be examined.

Moreover, a few weeks ago, Acland (son of Sir Thomas) wrote to tell me that he had got up a scheme for examining boys from the middle class schools in the West, and he wished to have the aid of the Council Office to carry out the plan. This has been agreed to, and I am going down next June to conduct an examination in Exeter accordingly.

Similar ideas are afloat everywhere; and it would require but a slight impulse to make the system general.

The Government will not take this in hand; the Society of Arts is well enough as a leader of the Mechanics' Institutes, but has neither the prestige nor the organisation to be more.

Will there be any chance of inducing the Universities to step in? My plan is this:—

That the University should appoint a competent Board of Examiners; that these examiners should be prepared to examine all boys between certain ages presented to them under certain regulations; that the examination should be divided into schools to cover the subjects at present most needed by boys in the middle class schools; that every boy who passes should have a Testamur from the examiners and the title *Alumnus* or *Scholaris* in *Artibus* of the University, and should be considered as in some sense matriculated; and that the expenses of the examination should be covered by a small fee from every candidate.

The University, you see, would give nothing but the title, and would have also the responsibility of choosing the examiners. The expenses would easily be met by the Fees. The examinations might be held once a year at Oxford; but also in the country wherever the local gentry chose to make arrangements for that purpose.

If Oxford began, Cambridge would soon follow. In this way the Universities would give a guidance to these schools which is sadly needed. And surely there is no function which Oxford might more appropriately offer to assume than that of guiding education all over the country.

I am quite sure that the right to put "S.A. of the University of Oxford" after one's name would be eagerly coveted.

I send you Acland's papers, which please to return in a day or two.

If you think well of the plan I will go to Gladstone

about it and make Acland go to Pusey. I am not afraid of being not supported by the Liberals, or Reformers, or Balliolites, or whatever you call yourselves, *unless on grounds of real objection*. But I fear that if it emanates from Balliol it will be resisted by many on that account alone. I would rather, therefore, that you said nothing about the matter in Oxford at present. . . .—Yours affectionately,
F. TEMPLE.

The original idea had been to ask the Education Department to conduct the work; but from the first Temple's wish was to make the Universities responsible for it, believing that freedom and elasticity and breadth of educational tone would be best secured in this way. He well puts this view in a letter urging the adoption of the title Associate of Arts as the designation of successful candidates:—

To Dr. Scott

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT, *June 6, 1857.*

I have another reason for wishing to keep the second A, which has more weight with me than I quite expect it to have with all. I want particularly to encourage that *general* as opposed to what is called *practical* education, which I believe to be so sadly deficient in most of our new projects of education. The world is running blindly towards substituting school for apprenticeship, and expecting the former to teach what can only be taught in the latter. This is doing much mischief, as you at Oxford will easily understand. The word Arts expresses better than any word I could invent that general cultivation of the faculties which I hope to see Oxford rewarding with her distinctions. You may make a man an Associate for many reasons; because he has a knack in this way or has made himself known in that way. But an Associate in Arts will mean a man who has got *something* of that larger and truer cultivation which is the best characteristic of our University system.

Scott took to the idea from the first, and Temple wished that, after the scheme had been seen by Acland and laid before Mr. Gladstone and other

authorities, his friend should bring the matter before the Hebdomadal Council. He proposed to visit Oxford on the subject, but a good deal of tactful management was needed :—

NOTTING HILL, *February 28, 1857.*

I am very glad that my scheme strikes you as feasible. I shall see what Acland will say to it next week and then try Gladstone. Perhaps you will not object, when the ground is prepared, to bring the matter before the Hebdomadal Council, if I write you a formal letter on the subject.

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT, *April 18, 1857.*

Now give me your advice on it. Jeune, from his connexion with Birmingham, will be the proper channel for bringing it before the Hebdomadal Council. But shall we be content with simply putting it into Jeune's hands and asking him to introduce it? Or shall we ask him to introduce *us* to the Hebdomadal Council, that under his wing we may say our say?

I am inclined to the latter plan. But the only day on which I can well manage to be in Oxford will be May 5th, when I must come and vote for Matt. And then perhaps the Council may not be in a very favourable mood. I might also come on the 21st or 22nd, and that might be better. Tell me what you think.

I mean if I can to pelt the University with such resolutions and memorials. And I think I shall get not a few.

It may be well here to insert an extract from one of the letters written by Mr. Temple to Dr. Jeune, to which reference is made in the Education Office Memoir.¹ It states very clearly the genesis of the movement :—

NOTTING HILL, *April 1857.*

MY DEAR MASTER—I promised to put on paper the substance of the conversation which I had with you in Oxford a little while ago on the subject of middle class education.

The education of the middle classes suffers at present from the want of any definite aim to guide the work of the school-

¹ "Education Office" Memoir, vol. i. p. 130.

masters, and from the want of any trustworthy test to distinguish between good and bad schools.

That the result is unsatisfactory all who know anything of the matter agree in proclaiming. It is constantly said, and said with truth, that many national schools now give a better education than can be obtained at schools of much higher pretensions. The masters in the national schools know precisely what they are expected to do, and know that the Government Inspection will almost invariably in the end bring into clear light whether or not they have done it. The masters who now teach the middle classes have no means of knowing either the one or the other. They are, speaking generally, expected to prepare boys for what is called business. Now this is so vague an aim that they may well be forgiven if they miss the proper means to reach it. But even if they so thoroughly understand their duties as to give precisely what is wanted, they have no means of convincing the parents of their pupils that they are doing so. In not a few instances the parents are misled into preferring what makes a show to what is really useful, and I have known a case where a very efficient master was driven away by the competition of one in every way his inferior, simply because the latter taught a showy but quite useless kind of penmanship. In all cases the plausible puffer has a most unfair advantage over the thorough teacher; an advantage which would instantly disappear if the work of the two were brought to any real test.

This neglected condition of the education of the middle class becomes more striking when contrasted with the great efforts made to improve the education both of those above and those below that class. The Universities, which have been to a great extent occupied by the upper class, are actively engaged in improving their system. The Government has spent two millions and a half upon the lower class, and is still spending at the rate of half a million a year. But nothing whatever is done for those who lie between.

And this neglected class has a very wide range, including many who are socially on a level with some of those who enter the Universities, and a few of the more active-minded among those who are taught in our national schools. Here are to be found, without doubt, the great body of our voters, of our taxpayers, of our ratepayers. It is obviously wrong to leave them out of sight when speaking of the education of the country.

The remedy, I believe, is in the hands of the Universities. If Oxford and Cambridge were to undertake the task of guiding and testing the instruction given in the schools of which I am speaking, I am confident that their guidance would be gladly accepted, would speedily remedy the evils that I have described, would confer a great benefit on the country, and would react most beneficially on the Universities themselves by increasing their popularity and the general sense of their value.

I do not think any complicated scheme is needful for this purpose. What I should propose would be this:—

That the University should confer some such title as Associate in Arts on every person who passed an examination before examiners appointed either by the Hebdomadal Council or by a Delegation, as might be thought best.

This examination should pretty nearly follow the precedent set by the present final schools. An examination of a somewhat similar kind to what I am proposing is to be tried in Devonshire this summer, at the suggestion of Mr. Acland; . . . and the way in which it has been welcomed by the classes for which it is intended proves that it suits their case.¹

Shortly afterwards Temple was in Exeter to take part in the examination of middle schools in the West, which had been the original idea in Mr. Acland's mind. He is eager and in good spirits, but not a little anxious as to the fate which might befall the proposed statute when laid before the University of Oxford: "I shall look for news at Exeter to-morrow morning with the greatest anxiety," he writes to Dr. Scott before starting. And again he returns to the subject:—

EXETER, June 17, 1857.

I am extremely anxious about to-morrow.

To-morrow evening we have a great gathering here about the Middle Class scheme. I shall have to speak and want to know what cue to take. I wish you would telegraph to me at the Clarence Hotel and let me know the result as

¹ *Oxford Associate in Arts Examination*, p. 75, by T. D. Acland, Esq.; Publishers—Ridgway (London); J. Parker (Oxford); Macmillan (Cambridge), 1858.

soon as it is settled. . . . We are in great force, and the Schoolmasters delighted.

The meeting at Exeter, on June 18, 1857, was large and enthusiastic, and long remembered in the city on its own account, and also for the speech which first introduced Mr. Temple to the notice of his future diocese :—

. . . I do not think that when Mr. Acland first proposed to hold these examinations he himself had the slightest idea—and most certainly when I heard from him I had not the slightest idea—of what was to come out of his proposition. It appeared at first sight to be a proposal to do something towards the improvement of the schools in the western counties, but as it went on, and the more it was discussed, the more it seemed to grow under our hands. It was put first before a few members of the Universities, who accepted it, as they said themselves, “with the greatest delight,” and it was only doubted whether it was possible to expect that the country at large would follow up the movement which had been commenced. It was followed up by applying to different parties in the country; and everywhere it was taken up with the warmest interest, and memorials poured in as fast almost as they could receive them, praying the Universities to adopt some scheme—not for the Western counties only, but for the whole of England. These memorials were presented to the Universities, and several of us who were most interested in the subject applied to the authorities of Oxford first, and afterwards to Cambridge—explaining what it was we had been thinking of, and how the country was prepared to support it in so hearty a manner if the Universities would take it up. I was in Oxford on a Friday, with several other gentlemen, and appeared before a committee of the Hebdomadal Council; and they (the Council) had a statute printed, and ready to be presented to the Council on the Monday following. I was also at Cambridge on a Friday, and on the Monday following the Council of that University had their report ready, and were prepared to go forward with the plan—so that both Universities showed the heartiest interest in what was proposed to be done. The interest still continues, and can be seen even at this moment. . . . The University of Oxford this day has passed the statute which will commence a system of examinations, and

will confer the title of Associate of Arts of the University on all those who come for examination and are able to pass it. There is the very strongest reason for accepting the offer of the Universities. . . . There are strong reasons why they should do it, and why they can do it better than any other bodies that can be named. Whatever there is in Oxford and Cambridge that is faulty (and I do not mean to say they have no faults), these faults they are doing their very utmost to amend as fast as they can, and they have also some great merits. In the first place, the Universities have an excellent method of teaching. They may not always have endeavoured to teach the right thing. It is possible that their system is too exclusive, and it may be a great improvement—in fact, I think it would be a very great improvement—to introduce other subjects into the University course. The Universities have, indeed, already shown that they think this would be an improvement, by enlarging their course so as to admit other subjects which have been hitherto excluded. But within the range of the subjects taught, the Universities certainly have a method of teaching which I do not think can be rivalled by any in the world—that method of teaching which makes the learning really a part of the learner's mind. . . . There is a very great difference between stuffing a man's brains with a certain amount of knowledge, and working that knowledge upon his character and upon the powers of his mind so as to turn him out really more of a man than he was before. It is this latter mode that is the merit of the University system of this country. It is acknowledged everywhere that the men who are turned out of the Universities of this country do show that they are really elevated above what they were before; and that the knowledge they have gained has not been merely so much information taken out of a book and shoved, as it were, bodily into their heads. This great merit of the Universities constitutes them, beyond all others in Europe, the best guides that can be taken for the improvement of education in general. But there is another merit, and it is this—I have never heard, and I am sure I never shall hear, one single word against the absolute impartiality of their decisions. The Universities are known for this—that when the examiners give their decisions upon the examination, they may indeed make mistakes, . . . but there is the most rigid absolute justice as far as man can secure it. This is a reason why they should be entrusted with such a work as

that to which I have alluded. I may add something more—that the Universities certainly have running through them a high tone and a high principle, which places them at the head of all education in this country. No man can have lived long in them without feeling that with all their faults, these faults are never such as to interfere with that kind of nobleness of character which has always distinguished them from the first. But, besides all this, there is still something further to be said as the reason for putting the Universities forward as the guides of education in this country. Everything we do for the country at large should be of a character to bind all classes together. The Universities educate the members, or a considerable portion of the members, of what are called the learned professions. The Universities also educate the great body of the upper class. It is of the greatest importance that there should be a strong opinion entertained of the importance of binding together this class with all the other classes in the country; and the Universities should be made to feel that they have an interest in the education of all England, and all England should be made to feel that they have an interest in the prosperity and excellence of the Universities. It is with this hope that we have attempted to persuade the Universities to undertake the work, as well as a considerable body who are interested in the education of those who do not go to the Universities, to support them. . . . I was asked to speak to you on the subject in general, and on that part of the examination which I have had more particularly entrusted to my charge. That which I have to deal with has been more especially language and literature. The *vivâ voce* examinations and the papers on these two subjects have chiefly engaged my attention. We lay very great stress upon this part of the examination, 'because we think that it is of peculiar value. It is so, because it is quite certain that one of the most important things you can do for any man is to teach him to think clearly, and there is no study which can better conduce towards clearness of thought than the study of language. I mean, of course, the study of language in a rational way. I do not mean a mere system of routine—a getting up of mere niceties which are to be remembered without the power of using them; but that power of language which enables a man exactly to understand his own words and exactly to understand another man's words. Side by side with the study of language stands that of literature. If

some other studies, such as mathematics and other sciences, have a greater value in cultivating the power of clear thinking, literature has the advantage over them in another respect; and that is, by this kind of study you do something more than fill the head. It is through the study of our great writers that we understand the sympathy which binds man to man; it is in the study of the works of great authors—such as Shakespeare, Milton, Burke, and such men as these—that we find that which reaches the heart. These works not only enable a man to understand his fellow-man, but they make him proud of his country, and they fill him with a warm feeling towards the past, and with hope for the future.¹

While at Exeter he had heard from Scott of the acceptance of the Scheme by the Oxford Convocation, and wrote with a good deal of prescience as to the future outcome of the enterprise:—

I think we have won the battle, and I must say that the Committee deserve great credit for the way in which they have fought it. I never expected a more complete victory, and for the last few days I expected nothing but defeat. *I have little doubt that we have planted a seed of no mean tree. What the tree will exactly be, we cannot yet tell; but it will be something considerable in the days of our posterity.*² . . . Now for working the plan. It will come to be a tolerably heavy job, I can tell you. But I have no doubt that your Dons have as much bottom as you have shown pluck.

During the next few months his thoughts were engrossed with his candidature for the Headmastership of Rugby, but, nevertheless, he found time for arranging further details, and for preparing for the work of the Scheme. Indeed, he kept his hand upon it for several years in spite of the heavy work at Rugby, and constant letters passed between him and Dr. Scott on the subject. He wrote the first Report at the close of 1858.

¹ Pp. 198-202 of *Oxford Associate in Arts Examination*. By T. D. Acland, Esq.

² Not in italics in the original.

December 5, 1858.

You will have the "Report" in your hands, I believe, to-morrow. I am very anxious that you should hold yourselves quite free to alter, omit, burn *ad libitum*. I have done my best, considering the really heavy press under which it has been written. And I do not think that any other delegate could have done it, for I do not think any other had all the details in his hand from end to end as I had. . . . But I am quite conscious that it may after all only express my own views, and I honestly have no desire that either in substance or in phraseology I should impose my own views on the rest.

One topic perpetually recurring in his subsequent letters was the settlement of the position and character of the examination in religious knowledge. Very marked is the exceeding care which he took to secure that justice should be done all round—to Dissenters, the University, and the cause of religious education itself.

The nature of the final settlement is mentioned in Mr. Roby's section; ¹ non-church at Cambridge, obligatory ² for all; denominational at Oxford, optional for all. Throughout the discussion he stood firm for the principle that while in his own University a certificate should be granted independently of the religious examination, it should not be endorsed with the statement that the candidate "had satisfied in the rudiments of faith" unless he had entered for the *whole* religious examination:—

RUGBY, December 9, 1864.

. . . I am decidedly against entering on the certificate a knowledge of the Bible without a knowledge of the Prayer Book. . . .

¹ "Education Office" Memoir, vol. i. p. 131. Note 1.

² Under the Cambridge plan religious knowledge was one of so many subjects, out of which three had to be selected; if religious knowledge were not selected a secular subject had to be prepared instead. (See Part xi. of *Oxford Associate in Arts Examination*. By T. D. Acland, Esq., 1858.)

His proposals are a first example of his dealing with the "religious difficulty," and indicate the principles on which, though with different methods of applying them, he always sought for a settlement. They were too impartial ever to commend themselves to everybody. In the present case he found himself on one occasion differing from Dr. Scott. With much delicacy of feeling and characteristic desire to go all lengths in deferring to the views of those whom he respected, he writes :—

May 5, 1860.

I have been much pondering over the discussion in the Delegacy this afternoon. Your feeling on the matter took me by surprise ; as (to my surprise) my course had taken you.

In these matters no man can quite realise the grounds of the opinions that differ from his own. And I find it hard to understand how you can oppose the concession to the Dissenters so decidedly ; while it seems to me so very much the less evil of the two that are before us.

But however that may be, of this I am clear : that a split in the Delegacy will not do, and especially a split between you and me. I shall not therefore bring the question forward again. And as long as you still hold to your view, I shall most decidedly join in resisting any attempt to coerce a minority in the Delegacy (if it should prove a minority) to acquiesce in what (as it appears) seems to you a matter of principle. I shall accept your view of the matter and do my very utmost to work it. On this point I dare say I may need some correspondence with you.

Forgive me the pain that I caused you to-day. It was most entirely unintentional. I feel as if I had been bandying words with my Father. You are hardly old enough to be that, but in *this business*, at any rate, you deserve that I should not lightly wound you. I had no idea that your dislike would amount to more than a preference for some other mode of meeting the difficulty.

May 7, 1860.

You will not think the worse of me when I confess that I was tempted by your kindness and began to think that I might press my own view after all. But it was a mere

passing feeling. I am certain it would not be right. And you need not encourage me to be obstinate in my own convictions. I am already tempted enough in that way.

Mr. Temple must also be credited with having been the first to propose that the University should undertake the *inspection* as well as the examination of schools. Two years after the inauguration of the local examinations he makes the following suggestion :—

February 2, 1860.

I hope to see you on Tuesday, when we meet the Cambridge folks.

Do you think it time to take another step forward? and do you think this step the next?

I am inclined to suggest that the Delegacy should send a circular to all those schoolmasters who have sent boys in to our examination, stating—

That the University contemplates the appointment of two or three officers to be called the University Inspectors of Schools; That the duty of these gentlemen will be to visit any school which applies to the delegates for the services of one of them, to examine it thoroughly, to report confidentially to the Headmaster or other school authorities, and to report generally (without giving any clue to names or places) to the University on prevalent defects and their causes, on successful methods deserving to be imitated, and on such other points as may be useful, without betraying confidence; That the confidential reports to the Headmasters will in no case be published without consent, but that if the school authorities wish to publish any *part* they must publish the whole; That the charge for the services of one of these officers will be three pounds a day, the Inspector to print his own papers and pay all his own expenses, and one day being allowed for the examination of every thirty boys; and that the delegates wish to know from the schoolmasters whether the appointment of such officers would be likely to assist them in their work.

There are many obvious difficulties in the way of all this. But just turn it over in your head and send me a line to Rugby to say whether I shall write to Jeune about it. It must be done some time or other, I think; and I do not want Cambridge to be beforehand with it.

Two months later he writes :—

April 25, 1860.

Thanks for what you say anent my scheme of an inspectorate. I will write a letter to Jeune for you to see first and then you will be better able to criticise. If you think the plan rash or premature when I have put it on paper, the letter can be burnt and nobody need be the wiser, except myself, who will have learnt what you object to.

The final allusion comes in the following year :—

May 6, 1861.

I have thought much about the organising of the examination by the Delegacy. My reason for not bringing it forward sooner was that I thought it better to deal with the religious question first. The ground is now clear both for that and for the question of appointing inspectors as well as examiners.

It was not Temple with whom first originated the idea of conducting the examination of middle schools by an external body, but it was he who suggested that the examination should be in the hands of Oxford and Cambridge, and to him, and those who worked with him, is largely due the credit of bringing the Universities into touch in modern times with national education. He saw the requirements of the situation and he knew his own mind : thus he inspired confidence as a leader, and by tact and perseverance the thing was carried through. "What does it matter who does a good thing as long as it is done," he was wont to say—doubtless a wholesome though a hard doctrine ; but he did not apply it to his friends :—

Yes (he writes to Sir Thomas Acland in 1896¹), I had guessed who was the anonymous writer. But I cannot help being amused at the interest taken in details of this kind : far more interest, it seems to me, than in the work itself.²

¹ *Memoir and Letters of Sir Thomas Dyke Acland*, p. 400.

² The founding of the University Local Examinations.

In the work itself and in the success of it, then, I took and I take a deep interest. But "who did what" is a very minor matter, and at this time not worth remembering.

I always looked on your proposing the examination as first conducted as having set the whole thing going. The rest was a matter of engineering. It is a pleasant recollection and has borne good fruits.

More than forty years after the establishment of the University Local Examinations, a meeting was held in Exeter to unveil a medallion to commemorate the labours in this connexion of his fellow-worker, Sir Thomas Acland, who had lately passed away. Dr. Temple was unable to be present at the meeting; but on the previous evening, at the close of a hard day's work, when it was plain that the thing he needed was to be still and do nothing, the Archbishop, then eighty years of age, sat down in the drawing-room of Lambeth Palace, and in spite of fatigue and failing eyesight indited the following tribute to the memory of his old colleague:—

LAMBETH PALACE, S.E.,
July 11, 1902.

MY DEAR LORD SPENCER—I am very glad to hear that you are going down to the West to do honour to my late friend Sir Thomas Acland. I wish I could be with you; for I loved and honoured him more than I can easily express. I first made his acquaintance when he planned his great examination of middle class schools in Devonshire. I was at that time, and for a little while after, one of Her Majesty's Inspectors of Schools, and I was directed by the Education Department to go down to Devonshire and hold the examinations which he had proposed. The arrangements for the examinations were his, and admirably planned. The examinations made a considerable stir, and he then¹ asked me to join him in an application to the Universities, and endeavour to persuade them to take up the work and give it a permanent character. The result was the establishment of what are now called the Local Examinations, which have steadily influenced secondary education ever since. In all this nothing

¹ The account of what actually took place is given above, pp. 541-549.

could exceed the patience, the perseverance, the labour, the self-sacrifice which showed the man that he was. He was devoted to the service of his fellow-men in the way in which he found he could serve them best. He never spared himself at any moment. He never clung to any theory of promoting what was good if experience showed him a better way. Most men who work hard in the service of their fellows are attracted to particular ideas which they are very loth to give up. But he was always ready to learn. Now to all this must be added the constancy and warmth of his affection for his friends, the high principles, strict truth, generous interpretation of other men's actions, which marked him as a thorough gentleman. He was an Englishman of the very best type, whose friendship was an honour to those to whom he gave it, whose memory will hold a place in all who knew him as long as they shall survive him, whose example will long be a guide and an inspiration, whose excellent work will bless many who will never know from what source the blessing comes.—Believe me, my dear Lord Spencer, yours very sincerely,

F. CANTUAR.

III. POLITICS

The move from Oxford to London widened Temple's political horizon, and the position which he occupied at the Education Office brought him into close contact with leading public men. The years of his stay in London (1848-1857) were eventful in the political world. They were marked by revolutions on the Continent, by rebellion and famine in Ireland, by the Sikh War in the Punjab, and by the Chartist movement at home. Later on came the Crimean War and the Indian Mutiny. London did not altogether feed the interest and excitement which the stirring events around him awoke in Temple:—

To Robert Lawson

PRIVY COUNCIL OFFICE,
June 24, 1848.

... This world of London is very unlike the Oxford world, abominably cold, selfish, longing to "get on"! I feel as if I had come into an atmosphere that I had never breathed

before. The perpetual roar of these streets sometimes makes me quite moody; and once or twice I have caught myself involuntarily thanking God that all this is but a shadow, and the real world lies deep behind. I can imagine a man an Atheist in beautiful scenery. I can imagine a man dreaming that the silent unchanging mountains are eternal and uncreated. But I cannot imagine any man with a soul being an Atheist in the midst of this din, or believing that such a world as now jars in my ears can be the real, the substantial. I am rather reflective this morning, but I have no news to tell you. I suppose you see some of the papers, and will know all about the bombardment of Prague, and the revolting atrocities of the Czechs, the inactivity of Carlo Alberto, the determination of Lord John to do nothing for the West Indians, etc. The world has much more to pass through yet, and Richard Cobden has not fathomed all the depths of human nature with his calico mete-yard, whatever he may think.

The three following letters to his sister Netta show the beginnings of those misgivings about the English treatment of Ireland, which afterwards bore fruit in the strong part which he took in favour of the Disestablishment of the Irish Church. The reference to the Chartist Rising gives an amusing illustration of the exaggerated alarm which it caused, and says something as to the want of bottom in the movement itself:—

July 24, 1848.

. . . But, after all, one's mind can hardly turn for any time from Ireland. It is a sad, a miserable thing. And they have so much to say. They have suffered so much at our hands; they wished to remain Roman Catholics—we forced them to support an Establishment in which they did not believe; they wished to retain the old line of sovereigns—we forced upon them King William and his Dutch wisdom; they wished to become a nation of small proprietors—we have forced them into the system of large farms, till, from not knowing how to manage it, it has almost utterly ruined them. I see no help for them. The most merciful end I can imagine is a great sacrifice on the part of England in the form of a heavy tax, and a deportation of the great mass of

them to Canada and elsewhere. As for Lord Clarendon, he has but one duty—to put down the rebellion with hot haste. He will now seize the ringleaders as fast as he can. The attempt to do so will test the meaning of all their furious speeches of the last week. I fear the poor things have too much falsehood in their composition even to fall gloriously. Their clubs are full of traitors who reveal everything to the police. The police do not clearly know their own feelings, and can be trusted by neither party. The monstrous exaggerations and downright falsehoods with which the speeches of the leaders are filled make matters look worse. What can be more horrible than for Duffy to tell his countrymen that in the time of the famine of 1847 there was corn enough in the country, but that it was shipped away for the good of the landlords?—both which statements he must know to be utter falsehoods! Such falsehoods to din into the ears of an excitable, uneducated mob! We shall have our share in a little while, in Bradford and Manchester and that country. The unanimity of Parliament in the matter is marked enough.

PRIVY COUNCIL OFFICE,
June 1, 1848.

It is astonishing to me what fears these Londoners live in. Yesterday the Chartists having promised themselves a meeting the police were ordered to stop it. They could, I am sure, have done it alone; but they called out the Specials, and all London was in mortal fear. I was dining at Sir F. Palgrave's, and R. Palmer offered me a seat in his carriage home. On the way I and Palmer began to amuse — by telling her that either the carriage would be seized for a barricade while we were hung up to lamp-posts, or that when she got home she would find a summons for Palmer to serve that night. The poor lady laughed; but I very soon stopped, for I saw with some surprise that she by no means thought it a laughable matter. Meanwhile, in reality, the London Chartists are a very poor set; I have got in amongst them and found no real earnestness. The northern men are a very different set, I am sure. The Londoners have nothing to fear.

March 7, 1849.

You see, I suppose, that Sir Charles Napier is ordered to take the command in India. He is on the high road to a peerage and a name in history. It is no small compliment

to a man that all eyes should at once turn to him as the man of the occasion.

The only other great thing is Peel's speech, which has made the Whigs look very small. They propose a rate in aid all over Ireland to help the starving districts. He supports them, but follows up his support by such a far-reaching scheme for future settlement of the difficulties that they seem but poor plodders in comparison. I wish he would turn them out.

The years were noteworthy in respect of the celebrity of the leading public men—politicians no less than great soldiers like Sir Charles Napier. Peel's public life was near its close, but Lord John Russell was still much in evidence; Lord Palmerston was in mid career; Mr. Gladstone and Mr. Disraeli were becoming famous. Temple's view of men and things as given to his friends are sufficiently racy and show great insight. In the spring of 1852 the first Derbyite Administration took office. Owing to the political weakness of the party they were not able to do anything striking, and had no great attraction on any ground for Temple:—

To Dr. Scott

The political world is not very interesting to me just now. These chaps cannot get rid of Protection and cannot propose it, ergo they cannot stay. Even the cry for compensation will not be listened to, I am quite certain. The only conceivable change is that of making funded property rateable, as it is in Scotland. But even that will not, I think, be allowed. *On dit* that the tactics of Lord Derby will be to go out on the Militia Bill. But they will not let him.

The great personality of Mr. Gladstone comes on the scene, and from the first Temple has misgivings; he is drawn to admiration and agreement on the one hand, and repelled on the other:—

I cannot say whether or not I shall vote for Gladstone. I wished to do so, if I could find some decent way of publicly expressing my disagreement with some of his tendencies.

But I have not been able to find any. So I suppose I must be content with silence. As to Marsham, I suppose no one votes *for* him. And I have not any wish to *oppose* Gladstone. What a scrimmage the elections are likely to be. So little that is definite put before the country. It is a Republic electing its President.

The result of the election gave no large majority to the Liberals and left the Peelites more or less masters of the situation. A Coalition Ministry began to be talked of:—

To Dr. Scott

OFFENHAM, July 31, 1852.

. . . The Liberals are alarmed by the elections. A coalition is being attempted: Lord Lansdowne to be Premier; Lord John, Home Office; Graham, Colonies; Gladstone, Exchequer; Duke of Newcastle, President. The details of this are mere *on dit*: the fact of the attempt is certain. This game I consider desperate. Lord Lansdowne can only be Commander's cloak, and Lord John will be Commander; the Peelites will see that and will not stand it. I doubt if they will even bring it to a trial, for the leadership of the Commons will be a bone of contention, and neither Lord John nor Graham will agree to resign it. And then, after all, who is to command the Irish brigade? While the Derbyites are in, they will attack the Derbyites; when the Derbyites are out, they will attack the next lot.

The Duke of Wellington died in the autumn. Temple's view of party politicians was on the whole not very high, and he hoped that the Chancellorship of his University would be filled by one who stood above party:—

KNELLER HALL, September 23, 1852.

. . . As to the Chancellorship of Oxford, I, who am a believer in Reform, after seeing the working of Prince Albert as Chancellor of Cambridge, should like much to have him at Oxford. But I fear there is no chance.

The first political duel between Mr. Gladstone and his great rival was approaching, and the

following letter gives Temple's first impression of the latter. Perhaps in the case of both these famous men first impressions were also the last;—

To Dr. Scott

December 6, 1852.

... This Ministry will stay in. And on the whole, I think, deserve to stay in. For though D'Israeli has shown that he cares for nothing but personal interests, yet he has shown also that Providence, for whatever reason, has endowed him with the gift of governing. And he is too great a genius not to see that in the country's best interest lies his own. So having found one good Pilot, by all means let him keep the Helm. The Budget is, I think, very clever. But he will not carry his exemption of the Irish Landlords from the Income Tax. But perhaps in that matter he wishes "conclusions to be as kisses," according to the play; he says "No," but wishes to be kissed for all that. The House Tax, too, will make a fight, but I do not think much of a one. The Colonials have got little out of him and the Shipbuilders no more. But the new mode of assessing Farmers to the Income Tax is a good deal to give them.

December 20, 1852.

The tearing to pieces of the Budget has been a remarkable section of Parliamentary history. The Exchequer Loan Fund money was perhaps the most indefensible appropriation that ever was made. The Income Tax adjustment, so good in principle, was perfectly monstrous in details. But the Free Traders showed ill on the question of the Malt Tax. What a great man that Gladstone is becoming! To tell the plain truth I begin to fear him, for I know that at bottom he and I differ *toto coelo*. D'Israeli has got his deserts. . . . As it is he has the glory of tracing the path which finance sooner or later must follow.

The strong points of the new Ministry were manifest, but so too its inherent weakness. Before its first year was over the country was within measurable distance of the Crimean War:—

KNELLER HALL, *December 28, 1852.*

. . . Did you ever see so strong a Ministry? But, as the *Times* remarked, the ingredients of an excellent plum pudding are there, but where is the bag? They sadly want cohesion.

KNELLER HALL, *September 27, 1853.*

. . . There seems little doubt now that war is at hand. We have borne enough and ought not to bear much more. I certainly have no desire to see Turkey upheld, but I should be very glad to see that big bully Russia snubbed. I do not think he will take much by his motion if he rouses us to action. But I am sorry that we, *i.e.* Europe, are splitting up so much. I almost hoped to see this year commence at Vienna the first germs of—

“The Parliament of Man, the Federation of the world.”

The anxieties of the time had their evident effect on the Ministers. Lord Palmerston alone was brisk and triumphant:—

KNELLER HALL, *August 31, 1853.*

. . . The Whigs are very weak in the Cabinet, except perhaps Palmerston. The said Palmerston is the only one of the lot that does not seem quite used up by the Session. Gladstone is more dead than alive; so is Lord John. The rest very so. But Palmerston seems as fresh as ever, and yet no man can do more in an office than he. He asked me the other day, “Did not I roll up Cobden in fine style the other night?” He was amusingly proud of that speech.

The Coalition Ministry fell, and Lord Palmerston was soon at the helm, but the new Ministers were not to Temple’s mind. He marks, from close quarters, the part taken by individual statesmen, and early lays a finger upon what seemed to him Mr. Gladstone’s want of decision where peace and war were concerned:—

KNELLER HALL, *May 23, 1855.*

. . . What did you think of Gladstone’s speech the other day in favour of peace? I was not at all convinced of anything by it except his extraordinary power as a speaker.

It is evident that Temple's vigour and capacity had already caught the eye of those in authority. Hence he had a share in the settlement of the new competitive methods which about this time began to be applied to the Civil Service. Shortly afterwards, as has been already noticed,¹ he was appointed one of the first examiners for the Indian Civil Service appointments:—

KNELLER HALL, *January 31, 1854.*

. . . Do you see how the Queen is about to remodel her whole Civil Service? I have not only watched, but laboured at the plan for some time, and it is delightful to see it succeeding. But do not tell. There is a Budget of Treason—not to be revealed—for you.

The following extract shows the convictions in his own mind which made him a ready co-operator in such reforms:—

KNELLER HALL, *June 14, 1854.*

. . . I believe the move (some shifting of the *personnel* of the Education Department) to have been a rebellion of the Whigs, which, as you know, form the tail of the present Government, against the Peelites, which form the head. The plan of having the Peelites to supply measures and men and the Whigs to supply votes was found deficient in a want of circulation of blood. You know that "patronage" is the blood of Governments; the extremities complained that the blood never reached them at all. On the occasion of the Oaths Bill (*i.e.* the Jew Bill decked in very fine peacock's feathers), a compact body of Whigs assembled at Brooks's and refused to go to the House. Hayter went to them with loud exhortations; but you know that moral force, which is enormous when it means physical force coming (*e.g.* the Pope, whilst he is known to be able to burn people in the other world whom he does not like in this, or England when her Ambassador comes on board a Fleet), is a nonentity when it means an appeal to conscience or reason or religious principle or other such cloudy fancies; Hayter once was strong, for his reasonings meant places in the Customs, Excise, Colonies, etc., etc.; but now Hayter found pure reason worked out

¹ *Supra*, p. 539.

deductively from the purest Whig principles a very poor mode of governing the world. The Whigs told him roundly that they would see him — before they would vote for a Ministry where the Tories had 32 places out of 35; Hayter asked the meaning, and found that some disappointed rebel had calculated, with much arithmetic, that to be the relative proportion in the distribution of good things. *O tempora, O mores*, I wonder this never got into the Conservative papers. . . . I can laugh at all this, but it makes my very heart ache. If there is one thing which Oxford always teaches those who endeavour to appreciate her teaching, it is the unselfish wish to sacrifice private interest to public good. . . . Gladstone wishes to cut up Patronage from the roots by his (for it is his) Civil Service scheme. But the Whigs and older Peelites cold-water him openly and laugh at him secretly. And I doubt if he will carry it in this House of Commons.

The incidental interests which have been mentioned (pp. 493-563) were serviceable to Temple in many ways, but it cannot be said that the actual LIFE AT KNELLER HALL, and the experience in connexion with the EDUCATION DEPARTMENT, satisfied the ideals with which he started when he left Oxford. Kneller Hall itself was a failure. The objects and methods have been fully explained in a previous memoir.¹ The following letter written to his friend John Duke Coleridge is a comment in his own words:—

To Mr. J. D. Coleridge

July 14, 1849.

. . . With regard to Kneller Hall . . . I wish I could tell you more than I can. But I cannot give more than a mere outline, because no more is yet in existence. It will be, however, a school in which the religious instruction (which will be entirely in *my* hands) is to be the centre of all the teaching. There will be daily prayers, taken from the Church

¹ See "Education Office" Memoir, vol. i. pp. 98-113.

Services, in the Chapel. The school will be open to all denominations, but no minister of any of the "Denominations" will be allowed to come into the place to teach. On Sundays they will probably attend service in the Chapel. But I have not yet made up my mind. I am a little doubtful whether they ought not in conscience to be allowed to attend their own meeting-house if they are Dissenters. What line of teaching shall I adopt? You perhaps can tell better than I can tell you. My mode will be by lectures on the Bible. I shall not hesitate to express my own convictions because they may jar with those of any denomination whatever. But I do not believe myself to be narrow, nor do I think you would think me so; I should rather expect indeed to be called shallow than narrow. So I do not expect to offend the Dissenters grievously. That on the whole the Church of England, more nearly than any other that I know, represents the ideal drawn in the New Testament, I very heartily believe and shall very heartily teach. That by virtue of her "succession" she possesses claims to allegiance independent of this conformity to Scripture I cannot teach, because I do not believe. There are three principles on which you can educate. The "Denominational," which you and Denison advocate; *i.e.* to help every sect to educate its own children, and of course in so doing to give up the very important control of the *political* bias of education which the State would naturally wish to exercise. The "Combined" system; *i.e.* to give secular education to all sects *together* and leave the religious education out, this latter being entrusted to the clergy of the different denominations; this is Hook's scheme, and is also the plan pursued in France and Prussia. The "Comprehensive" system, which brings children of different denominations together and teaches them religion, but avoids controverted points; this is Arnold's plan, and in *some* sense mine. In some sense; for I do not profess to leave out controverted points as *such*, but only where I consider them non-essential. And if it be found that on this footing I cannot satisfy the demands of "the situation," out I must go, for "syncretism" is my abhorrence. In fact, you can quite see that the whole tendency of the plan depends upon how it is worked. It remains to be seen whether there is not an aspect of the Church which can absorb dissent so far as education is concerned. You will say, and I will allow, that it cannot absorb without affecting its own character. But is there nothing, no vital force, no fresh vigour, which the

Church may healthily derive from the Dissenting bodies? However, I do not mean that such a course would tend to give greater strength to what are ordinarily called High Church principles, though I do not think it would very seriously weaken them. The object of Kneller Hall is to provide Masters for Workhouse Schools. I shall of course be glad if the clergy have sufficient confidence in my teaching to take Masters for National Schools from the College. But that must depend on the line which you and your friends think right to take. My own sphere is no small one, and with God's help shall be worked with all the energy with which either my mind or my body is able to work it. . . . What do you say to all this? Do you seriously believe that the Government will come nearer to the Church than by establishing a normal school entrusted to a clergyman on such a modification of the "Comprehensive" system as I have described? The "Denominational" won't do. The State will by and by be called upon to vote a million a year¹ for education: do you think it will do this and then say to each sect, Do what you please with it? Can you not see that the immediate result of such a system always is to throw all the power into the hands of the ultras of each sect (for the ultras are the enthusiasts), and will the State give up so important a thing to the ultras? Why, one of the chief instincts of that organisation which we call the State is to bring the power of the Moderates to repress the Ultras, and never, except at times of revolution, does this instinct cease to work. The "Denominational" taken bare will not do. Such a modification of it as is represented by the Management Clauses² would work tolerably. If you will not have that, you must have the horrible "Combined." In workhouse schools, where of necessity children of different denominations come together, you must either have the Combined or Comprehensive. *Voilà tout.*

This letter, as is seen, besides indicating the line

¹ "Education Office" Memoir, vol. i. p. 121, with note 2.

² The Management Clauses, introduced by Government in 1844, required that in all cases where Government Maintenance Grant was given to an Elementary School a committee should be appointed for Secular teaching and General Management, whilst the charge of the religious and moral instruction was placed in the hands of the incumbent and his curates (see *Elementary Education*, by Dean Gregory, pp. 62-65; also *infra*, letter from Temple to Coleridge, March 8, 1850, p. 573).

on which he proposed to work the Kneller Hall system, branched out into a comparison of different systems on which religious instruction in national education could be based. It naturally produced a reply from his friend, who at that time was in close relation with the leaders of the Church party, and Temple writes again :—

July 27, 1849.

. . . Now for your remarks. (1) I shall turn your flank about the theory of the Church. I believe in the Communion of Saints, in the Church as channel of Grace, in the real efficacy of the Sacraments. But I do not see that this at all interferes with what I have said. The question is whether the Church is constituted by "Succession." I am myself a clergyman, deputed by the Church, the present living Church, not the Church of the Apostles, nor the Primitive Church, nor the Mediæval Church, but the Church now on earth, and, if you will, in heaven. I am glad, heartily glad, we have the Apostolical succession.¹ It makes up the total of those attractions which bind us to the Church. It enables a class of minds to remain with us who are perhaps in many ways the most beautiful characters we have amongst us. But that this, and this alone, makes such a difference that the Anglican rests on the "sure promise," while the Presbyterian is left to the "uncovenanted mercies," is what I cannot either believe or teach. (2) With regard to Comprehensive education, remember the whole question is one of fact. Are the different forms of Protestantism sufficiently near to enable them to be taught by one mind? I do not profess that I can teach everybody. I should not object to Roman Catholics entering my school, but I should not hesitate to tell them that what I was teaching would tend to weaken their Roman Catholicism. That every one will agree with me I do not say; and by not giving offence I only meant such offence as to create hostility. Is there more difference of opinion at bottom between the different "Denominations" in this island than between the different parties within the Church? I do not believe it. I believe that with most Dissenters the setting before them a *real body* of doctrine would scatter their shadowy theology to the winds. With many others a covert Unitarianism is

¹ "Exeter" Memoir, vol. i. p. 389. "London" Memoir, p. 10.

at the root, which I should feel no hesitation in attacking with all my might. But with *all* I should feel that the habits of early youth, the respect for their parents' feelings and teaching, the influence of the friends they had made in their own sect, must be attractions to keep them where they were, such as I must respect. And if I could give them the tone of the Church of England and no more, I should be satisfied. (3) As to the Protestant confessional, I shall certainly cultivate personal intercourse and real openness. But I shall not make any such system as either — or — wish to see. I value stern self-dependence; they do not. You know the fable of the man who was allowed for a short time to rule the weather; he did not get good crops. Neither are good crops of a spiritual kind to be obtained by the substitution of art for nature, or, in my view of it, of man for Providence. And I question much whether the view *you* take of the confessional is borne out by facts. The Roman Catholic system, of which it is the emblem, does not succeed with the mass, but with the few. Their complaint of us is that in England we have good citizens, good fathers, good husbands, etc., but no saints. The analogy holds. You can by artificial means grow one ear of wheat bigger than ever was seen in the fields; but if you tried the same means on the whole field you would get a few big ears and a very poor crop. But I will not press the point, because I do not think we really disagree here. (4) Athanasius *contra mundum* is perhaps the natural tone of a man who finds himself at work, and all his convictions enlisted, with men whom he does not much love against others whom he does. But in my case it was quite unconscious. That we go on a system of compromise is true enough, but you forget that the present system is a modification of the Denominational, and not of the Comprehensive, and that you have already got the lion's share in the Division. The political bias of the education would never be in the Office. But with whom is it to rest; with the clergy or the mass of the people? Shall a clergyman have the power to get the children taught that James II. was wrongly dethroned, that kings rule by a diviner right than Parliament, that the Puritans were fighting from pure malevolence, that Queen Mary I. was quite right in her dealings with the Protestants, or at any rate quite as right as Queen Elizabeth in her dealings with the Roman Catholics, etc., and shall the laity of his parish have no power to

turn such books out and introduce others just of a contrary tendency? The fight will come. But, again, suppose you started with the Denominational plan in full swing. Give up the management clauses, and let the clergy have the sole control of the schools. In five-and-twenty years the laity begin to discover the trap in which you have caught them. Over half the country you would immediately have rival schools, probably on the Combined system, which ultimately would force the State to assist them, and the Church, from being the educator of the nation, would soon sink to be the educator of a sect. Can you coolly contemplate the result; millions who *might* have been brought up under the Church sent to a system which left religion to shift for itself? The Office, as things go on, must have one kind of influence,—that of rebuking the idle and mismanaged schools. But it is not for the Office that I wish more, but for the mass of the people. I am firmly convinced that, as in the State, so in the Church, as in other political institutions, so in the matter of education, the only guarantee for permanence, for reality, for effect, is to build upon the people. You must provide that the whole nation is interested in a national work, or it will be ill done. . . .

With the Kneller Hall period a new friend is added to the number of Temple's correspondents—Mr. Frank Palgrave, a former Balliol pupil who, on Jowett's recommendation, went with Mr. Temple to Kneller Hall as Vice-Principal.¹ Mr. Palgrave's friendship continued through life. He was eventually Professor of Poetry at the University of Oxford, and is well-known as the author of the *Golden Treasury*,² and as a critic on poetry. The correspondence with him includes many references to literary topics and matters of general interest. The first of Mr. Temple's letters may be

¹ "Education Office" Memoir, vol. i. p. 100.

² "I have been reading your *Golden Treasury* with the greatest interest and pleasure. There are one or two things that I miss which I expected to find: Wordsworth's 'Let other bards of angels sing,' Coleridge's 'Good, great man'; and a few others. But I like the book exceedingly; nearly everything that I cared for is in it; hardly anything that I did not care for."—Letter to Mr. F. Palgrave, August 6, 1861.

usefully read as a supplement to the Coleridge letters :—

To Mr. F. Palgrave

January 17th, 1850.

. . . The Committee passed my minute at last. They stuck in this sentence about the *vexata quaestio* of religious instruction : “The religious instruction will be confided to the Principal if a clergyman of the Church of England ; if not, a Chaplain of the Church of England will be charged with that duty. No student will be required to learn any religious formulary to which he entertains a conscientious objection.” This addition I think on the whole judicious, though I do not think it will save us from attack. Generally in the country the clergy appear to use Kneller Hall as a translation of γέννα. What you and I come to be in such a view of our kingdom, you may guess.

Subject to a few alterations in detail, the lines indicated in these letters were those upon which Temple thought and worked on the religious side of education throughout the Kneller Hall period.

But the system did not satisfy either the High or Low Church clergy of those days. Arch-deacon Denison represented in this matter a large body of opinion on both sides. They were opposed to the Management Clauses,¹ and also to the Conscience Clause ; they looked upon Kneller Hall with great suspicion and gave it the cold shoulder. This feeling found expression in the press and in public speeches, and in the many indirect ways which tell upon those attacked more effectively than direct opposition. This atmosphere of suspicion seemed to surround Temple at Kneller Hall on all sides : it affected the supply of students, and was specially painful to him as a clergyman conscious of his loyalty to the Church. —

¹ *Supra*, footnote, p. 565, and *infra*, p. 573.

To Mr. J. De Coleridge

February 9, 1850.

. . . I do not want the clergy to approve of Kneller Hall. What I have undertaken here is to cultivate a small portion of the field in a peculiar manner. I do not wish to push that beyond the portion assigned to me. The clergy have not the Workhouse children, and from the nature of the case cannot have them under their care. But the clergy do not like the Management Clauses. Why do they not make a reasonable effort to modify them? The Roman Catholics have no love for "general Religion." But they will admit any one into their schools on the condition so absurdly rejected by our clergy, that the parents shall if they please withdraw them from the whole or a part of the religious instruction. A proposal by the clergy to do this would put matters in a very different position. They might then fight with something to say. Now they have nothing. You repeat that the Church has grievances. I wish you would tell me what. I do not doubt what you say, but I want to know where exactly the shoe pinches a practical man's foot. Do not be so sure about the rating not being carried. It is quite as reasonable to have a compulsory rate to teach a poor man how to get his bread as one to give it him when he cannot get it. There is the example of Scotland too, where there has been a compulsory rate since '88 [Scottish Parochial Schools Acts, 1646 and 1696]. . . . Once more I repeat, I was not in my last letter making any plea for Kneller Hall. I will work this place if I can, but I do not expect your friends ever to help me. But I still feel myself a clergyman, a sworn minister of the Church, and as a clergyman I feel deeply the injury which these men are likely to do the Church. The Church schools are in real peril.

A month later he writes a more formal and detailed letter, expounding the situation :—

March 8, 1850.

. . . I suppose you are busy on Circuit, and not very well able to attend to affairs of State and Church. But I think you may have an opportunity of preventing mischief even in your travels, and therefore I write to you. What particularly induces me to write at this moment is the appearance of two phenomena in opposite quarters of the horizon. One is the

petition against "My Lords," now being circulated with Keble's name at the foot of it. The other is Fox's Education Bill. The petition contains so gross a misstatement as deserves something more than a charge of common carelessness. Keble asserts flatly that persons who found schools and entrust them to the sole care of the clergyman with an appeal to the Bishop are precluded from their share in the public money. Now the grant, as you know, is £125,000. About £25,000 out of that goes to pay Inspectors' salaries, travelling expenses, etc., and to work the Office. Of the remaining £100,000 as much as £60,000 is spent in grants to pupil teachers and deserving schoolmasters, quite irrespective of any Management Clauses or of the constitution of the school in any way. It is absurd to say that a school is deprived of its share in the Parliamentary Grant when it may get a great part of the master's salary (not an easy thing to provide) paid by Government, and boys picked out of his school and paid to assist him. Now surely Keble would not allow a paper to be circulated bearing his name if such an inaccuracy as this were pointed out to him. His asserting it will have more weight with most men than another's swearing to it. . . . Now you know Keble well. Cannot you point out this to him? . . . Fox's Bill is a wider subject, and I fear neither you nor I can do much with regard to it. First, with regard to the Bill itself and its inevitable operation if carried. It proposes, first, to ascertain in what districts there are no schools and in what there are not enough; second, to levy in both classes of districts a compulsory rate; third, to entrust the administration of the rate so levied to a Board elected by the ratepayers, but subject in all its movements to the Committee of Council; fourth, to establish with this rate *free* schools in the districts above described; fifth, to exclude religious instruction from these schools, but to provide that time shall be allowed for such instruction to be given in whatever manner the parents may wish; sixth, to empower the Committee of Council, if it disapprove of the scheme of education of the local Board, to set aside the Board and act in its stead. . . . The operation of the Bill would be this. In districts where no schools already existed it would entirely preclude the formation of one. To get subscribers in a district which already had to pay a rate, and in which the people could already obtain a good elementary secular education, is, on the face of it, not to be hoped. In districts where the Government school came

in to supply a deficiency, but not a total want of schools, it would rapidly empty them. With the machinery at their command the Government would be pretty sure *in most cases* to give a much better education than others; *and the Government school would be free.* Add to this the prestige that attaches in all countries to what is done by Government, and you will see that it would be Aaron's rod in regard to private attempts. The measure, therefore, is so framed that secular instruction would gradually sweep over the whole of England and displace the present national system. Now, secondly, for the chance of the Bill being carried. I do not think it will pass now. But though not likely to pass now, its passing ultimately is quite certain if the clergy persist in the line they are now taking. Look back and see the course things have taken since 1839, when first the question became a public one. In 1839 the Church rejected the proposal of the State to establish a system of secular instruction and claimed the right, and by so doing pledged herself to the duty, of educating the people. To redeem that pledge, in the same year the National Society awoke from its sleep, the celebrated letter of the Archbishop got a collection far beyond the Parliamentary Grant, and the Church proved that the work of education belonged to her by showing that she had already occupied the field. But though she was alone in the field she did not cover it, her schools were as yet almost the only ones, but there were still vast masses of the people who had no schools at all, some of these people her own, some Dissenters. To provide for these became the duty of the State, and negotiations were commenced with the National Society to see if they could not be taken into the Church schools. It was plain that for this purpose they must be allowed to retain their religious opinions, and it was therefore proposed that all parents should have the power of withdrawing their children from the religious instruction. By this means Dissenters could send their children to the Church schools without compromising their principles, while the Church retained the power of appointing the schoolmasters and giving a tone to the schools. The clergy were mad enough to reject this. They insisted that they should have the right of teaching the Catechism to every child that came to them. And the result of the negotiations was the Concordat of 1840, which distinctly separated the Church from all other bodies, putting her down to a level with them. She was to have separate officers,

separate schools, and to be in fact one body amongst many, a sect like the rest, only richer and more numerous and with seats in the House of Lords. This Concordat of 1840, so far as it went, affirmed the Denominational principle. Each Denomination was to have money given to it and educate its own people in its own way. And practically the Church refused to educate any but her own people. So matters went on for several years, during which it became apparent—first, that on this plan great masses would remain uneducated, *e.g.*, the poor Methodists in Cornwall and Wales; second, that the system was very inefficient, because large schools are always more powerful engines of education than small ones; third, that it would ultimately be, what in this country is a fatal objection, very expensive.

A second attempt was then made to modify Church schools in such a manner as might give some hope that the education of the great body of the people would be performed by her. This was done by introducing the laity into a share of the management, and so binding up the people with the Church schools on the one hand, and reining in the exclusive spirit in the same schools on the other. Here, too, the National Society was consulted, and the result was the Management Clauses of 1846.¹ Now why was not the same offer made to the Church in 1846 as had been made in 1840?² Clearly because she did not occupy the same position. She was no longer alone in the field; other bodies called up by her own act were in full activity beside her. The field itself had enlarged, immensely enlarged, and she had not extended her operations to meet it. She was, as far as education was concerned, only the most powerful sect, not the Church of the land. Yet even then I verily believe that a very great difference would have been made had the Church offered, of her own accord, to accede to the terms of 1840. Exactly those terms she could not have got. It would not have been fair. But she might have had something very different from what she has.

As things were, the Management Clauses seemed the only practicable scheme. They have been at work four years. The clergy are rejecting them. Fox's Bill is the next step,

¹ See "Education Office" Memoir, vol. i. p. 127.

² In 1840 the Church party rejected the proposal of Government that Nonconformists should have the power of withdrawing their children from religious instruction. In 1846 the Management Clauses were made the condition of maintenance grants.

and the matter is settled. The Denominational system¹ is, once for all, out of the question. The mere fact of the enormous expense is enough to condemn it. But even if possible with Sectarians, it is essentially impossible with an Established Church. Unless the Church is to exclude from within her pale all who do not belong to her on deliberate choice (which is what all Sectarians must do), she cannot work on the Denominational scheme, because she is not a Denomination. She contains many who would not at all accede to the claims of the Denisonian clergy. She contains as an Establishment a variety of opinions within her which render her totally unlike a sect. And she will fall to pieces if she attempts to work as sects do. The Roman Catholic schools might safely be entrusted to the priest alone. But in one case out of every three in which you did the same with a Church school you would by the end of twenty years see the school enfeebled by the presence of another school set up by the laity beside it, or at any rate by the withdrawal of the support of the parishioners. . . . I am afraid the current is set, and cannot be stemmed. But, at any rate, if you prevent Keble's Petition from doing mischief you will do much.

The language of these letters is trenchant; but the principles at the back of them are in reality those which governed Temple's mind on educational matters throughout his life, viz. the conviction that religion ought to enter into the national system, but that the rights of the individual conscience should be respected. At that time, in the interests of those rights he contended with Churchmen; it was in the interests of the same rights that, forty years later, he found himself forced to oppose the position taken by the majority of Nonconformists. The system at Kneller Hall was an expression of his principles. It respected the rights of the students. "No student will be required to learn any religious formulary to which he entertains a conscientious objection," is the

¹ The Denominational system was then generally worked *without the Conscience Clause*.

language of the Government minute;¹ but the Catechism was not excluded,² nor did he 'profess to leave out controverted points *as such*, but only where he considered them non-essential';³ nor was he precluded from expressing 'his own convictions' in giving religious instruction.' The system was largely a precursor of Mr. Forster's Bill of 1870 in the form in which that Bill was first introduced, and it expressed the spirit in which Temple hoped that that Bill would be worked. It was the Bill without the Cowper-Temple Clause or the spirit of compulsory undenominationalism: "syncretism" (which is modern undenominationalism), wrote Temple to Coleridge, "is my abhorrence."⁵ But the Kneller Hall system was before its time. The clergy were not prepared for it, and did not understand it. As the result of six years' hard work after leaving Oxford he found himself distrusted by many of the clergy, and the fact goes a long way to explain that attitude of detachment⁶ as regards his brethren perceptible in the earlier years of his clerical life. It was not by Archdeacon Denison's followers only that he was attacked:—

To Robert Lawson

KNELLER HALL, April 13, 1852.

. . . I am just trying to calm down a furious attack from the Low Church folks. Do not talk of it; for I hope by stroking them the right way, to get them to purr. My refusing to join in a petition against the Pope last October and not allowing bonfires on the 5th of November is a great grievance unto them. Then I have only one sermon on Sundays⁷ and prayers three times, whereas the proportions ought to be inverted. Then I do not preach the Gospel. Then I have expressed an opinion that the latter part of Isaiah was written by a prophet who lived towards the

¹ *Supra*, p. 569.

² See "Education Office" Memoir, vol. i. p. 101.

³ *Supra*, p. 564.

⁴ *Supra*, p. 564.

⁵ *Supra*, p. 564.

⁶ "Exeter" Memoir, vol. i. p. 404.

end of the captivity. Then I have said that I do not consider Sunday to be a Divine ordinance in any other sense than as being the regulation of the Church. Then a general charge of being so High Church that all the Low are afraid of having anything to do with me. These are the accusations proposed to be laid before "the House."

But had the action of sections of the clergy and the Church laity been the sole obstacle, Temple would have surmounted it. In course of time the meaning of his action would have been understood, and opposition would have yielded before his courageous perseverance. But the Kneller Hall scheme was unworkable in itself,¹ and was, moreover, rendered impossible by the attitude of the Government towards it. The enterprise had been undertaken in deference to the enthusiasms of a few; but education had not then been recognised as a subject of national importance, and had not really taken hold of the public mind. There were symptoms and beginnings of what would be; but the fruition of enlightened hopes was as yet a long way off. Education, in the eyes of public men, was at best but a very insignificant part of the machinery of the State. The barometer went up and down with each change of Ministry, or even of individual members, and fell steadily if untoward incidents, such as a great war, intervened in national life. The first Derby Administration, which entered upon office in 1852, shortly after Temple had accepted the position of Principal, had no love for Kneller Hall at all. To them it was altogether a doubtful experiment, and meant coquetting with Dissenters, which was distasteful to the majority of their supporters. "Politics meanwhile are looking very black for me. *My* work is really in danger," writes Temple to Scott in June 1852. Two months later he comments:—

¹ "Education Office" Memoir, vol. i. pp. 103-107.

To Dr. Scott

I am still in *statu quo*, except that in some changes of system they have so lowered the salaries of the workhouse schoolmasters (excessively low before) that I expect no candidates at Christmas.

He is hopeful though not confident as to his relations with the Coalition Cabinet :—

KNELLER HALL, December 28, 1852.

. . . On Saturday I hope to see Gladstone, and then commences my work, for these new masters of mine will certainly require to go into all the details of all my matters. . . . Whether they will like Kneller Hall is perhaps doubtful. It may be that I have got out of Scylla into Charybdis. The last lot disapproved of educating paupers. Perhaps the present may disapprove of my admitting Dissenters. Ought not the fact of only four Dissenters having yet come here and all having gone away Churchmen (not High Churchmen, but still Churchmen) to mollify them on that score.

But no good came from the new Ministry. Before six months are over he is writing :—

. . . I also might tell you how I have been plagued into sending in a quasi-resignation—and how it has not been accepted—and how I am at war with all the Cabinet—and a great many other such hows which have not yet come to any definite conclusion, except that I have assigned them six months more in my own mind to do what I want: after which time—the Deluge.

The fact was that the Crimean war was diverting the thoughts of both country and Ministry from education. Parents were taking their boys from public schools,¹ and Ministers were no longer

¹ It was to the Crimean war that Dr. Temple attributed the decline of the numbers at Rugby school during his predecessor's time. "Poor Goulburn in his third year had precisely the number that I have now in my third year. Then came the Crimean war, and Rugby was the first to feel it; but now the tide is the other way, and I get the full benefit after he had all the loss. I wonder whether, if another war were to carry off all the youth to military tutors, etc., as the last did, Rugby would be the first to feel it again."—August 31, 1860.

willing to spend public money on a doubtful "fad" like Kneller Hall. However, the President of the Council was urbane and kindly, and the Principal took heart of grace :—

Lord Granville has been uncommonly civil lately ; made me all kinds of verbal promises, done everything except come to the veritable point. Time and patience, I suppose, are needed here as elsewhere.

But hopes were only raised to be dashed ; all is doubt and suspense. Three months later he is writing :—

KNELLER HALL, *November 11, 1853.*

. . . Kneller Hall is in the very crisis of its fate, and I am much bothered by the suspense in which the whole business hangs. I told the Committee long ago that in this recess they must determine to go forward or abandon Kneller Hall altogether. They profess to be now determining. What I most dislike in the aspect of matters is that I see symptoms of a *rapprochement* between the Derby Government and the present in regard to us, and I hear from various quarters that Talbot, Lord Derby's Private Secretary that was, goes about declaring that he will get Kneller Hall for the Wellington Testimonial. Meanwhile Lord Granville promises to support my plans, and I know that Lord Lansdowne will ; reason good, for otherwise he would be stultifying himself. But I fear Gladstone, Palmerston, and Lord John. Suspense is hard to bear.

For a while the barometer rises. There is a note of hopefulness in the following letter to the Vice-Principal of the College, but he learns, like many officials who wish to, spend money, what is the *fons et origo mali* :—

To Mr. F. Palgrave

January 21, 1854.

Yesterday I saw Lord Granville, who was very civil and said that the Committee would meet on Tuesday and settle all things. I then by good luck caught Palmerston and had a long talk with him. He told me plainly that

he would support the Kneller Hall plan with *all* its consequences; but that nothing could be done without money, and he feared the whole would fail for that. The Chancellor of the Exchequer, he said, in the present state of foreign affairs had a right to be first heard. But nothing could be more go-ahead than Lord Palmerston's own inclinations, if he was not playing off a little diplomacy.

Lord Palmerston swallows his reports and asks for more :—

To Dr. Scott

Palmerston is like the woman in the *Tales of Wonder* who called ever for more meat. I only hope I may awake some morning and find him turned into something wondrous beautiful. I never in my life had such incessant hard work in the way of reports, statistics, etc. He swallows them all down and gives no symptom of having had enough.

Three months later comes another change of masters :—

KNELLER HALL, *June 14, 1854.*

I am here, as usual working very hard to no purpose. Lord John comes in to control the Orders in Council, not to govern the education; so that he will do me no good. Moreover, he has not been an attendant at committees since March, and so for form's sake he issues the usual orders for returns, reports, etc., which belong to a new Lord President; and so he gives me much work.

The work, if not profitable, is more to his mind than mere civility :—

June 14, 1854.

. . . —² put me off so often with invitations to dinner when I wanted to do business that I came to hot words, and got preciously snubbed, as you may suppose, to say nothing of a total stoppage of "cold swarry" from that time forward. I *hate* civility; don't you?

Seven months more of alternations between hope and despair, and then the end came :—

KNELLER HALL, *May 20, 1855.*

. . . I am not going on well with this Cabinet, and have in fact resigned Kneller Hall. . . I shall probably take an Inspectorship for the present, but as soon as I can creditably disentangle myself from the Government Service I shall. It is not pleasant to say or to think thus, but I fear that I have no other conclusion to which I can rightly come.

He announces the coming collapse to Robert Lawson with more lightness of tone, but his heart, though brave, is heavy :—

To Robert Lawson

KNELLER HALL, *May 16, 1855.*

Total all up with Squeers. They have accepted my resignation. It is not yet a public fact. And I suppose it must not be for some days. But it is finally determined on. They have not, however, the audacity to propose to carry on Kneller Hall without me. They are going to make it a barrack or a lunatic asylum or something of that sort. What a triumph for Denison and Co.! Down goes the godless College! Hurrah for the true Church!

I am sorry to lose my House of Cards which I have laboured at for five years. Down it all topples with a puff of adverse breath from Cornwall Lewis. I feel as if I were seven years back in my race, and had to commence again; this time, too, with health by no means what it was, to say nothing of the dark threatenings of a few years ago. But I won't be a coward, and, while I have the breath, will fight. Come to me if you can. Meanwhile say nothing to nobody.

A month later Kneller Hall is closed :—

To Dr. Scott

June 21, 1855.

. . . The Minute closing Kneller Hall has been launched at my head at last, and the matter is now no secret. I feel as much ashamed of myself as if I had just been married, and would gladly hide myself from all society. When do you mean to come here? I want to talk to you.

Times of anxiety affected Temple's health; and it is easy to see that strain had much to do with what he says to his closest friend :—

KNELLER HALL, June 6, 1855.

DEAREST ROBERT—You are as good as gold, and I am a petulant goose. Perhaps if my conscience were as quiet as yours I should stand all this wear and tear better. Believe me, I would sacrifice all this magnificence of “high aims,” which you ascribe to me, for one spark of genuine, honest goodness, such as I can see in the face of Charles Moberly¹ when I look at him. It is miserable to feel oneself made up of big wishes and no will: miserable to be so eager for a success which after all is a very earthly prize: miserable, above all, to feel, as I often do, overvalued by those who know me, and only needing detection to be despised. I am vexed with myself that these things should move me so much; but the fear of many evils is far worse than the reality, worse at least to bear. Do you not think that in early Christian times the martyrs who “suffered” must have suffered much less than the martyrs who did not “suffer”? And I have not the consciousness of being worthy to uphold me. Is it a shame for me to vent my spleen in my letters to you? for to no one else alive do I say all this. But I know you will forgive me. Do not be seriously alarmed about my turning Roman Catholic or marrying the rich widow. Of such a denouement there is not the smallest chance. I sometimes, I confess, quite honestly wish that I *could* turn Roman Catholic. But the thing is impossible, and the wish arises from that longing for an escape from unceasing sense of responsibility which I cannot repress. I am not at all incapable of wickedness. I sympathise quite deeply with the man who said that he never heard of a bad action which he was incapable of committing. But I am quite incapable of blindness while I am still sane. Do not talk to me of high aspirations as if there were any virtue or value in them. They do a man *no good*. They are often purchased by the sacrifice of self-control, and conscientiousness. They are like the ἐθελοθησκεία, of which S. Paul so decidedly disapproves, having the show of wisdom in their apparent neglect of the body, but tending to the satisfying of the flesh. Clearness of insight into duties and doctrines seems to me to be often purchased by want of faithfulness in discharging the one and laying to heart the other. If I had only others to complain of it would not perhaps be hard to “put trust in the Lord” in the certainty that “He would comfort the heart.” But

¹ His brother-in-law. “Earlier Years” Memoir, vol. i. p. 16.

what if the baffling that I have met with only bring to clearer light my own faults and follies? "Mend them," you will say. Yes, indeed, mend them, as I would mend a pen! "Then go ahead and do not mind them." Very easy! "Colonel, I have caught a Tartar!" Bring him along. "I can't." Then come without him. "But he won't let me."

It is tantalising you to write thus. But you tempt me to tantalise you. And a man cannot be so good as you are to a friend without paying for it. My soul refuseth comfort. Do not comfort me by saying that I am judging myself by too high a standard. I am not.

I find but one thing that is comforting, and that is prayer in Church. Not prayer alone, for alas! that is a very difficult duty, and always has been to me. But prayer in Church. And I sometimes could wish that the service were ten times as long as it is. Meanwhile, to complete this long outpouring of egotism, you must know that I am really by no means very bad when I am not tempted. Virtuous that! If I were always out of all temptation I really think even an angel would not be able to find much fault in me. When are you coming here?—Yours most affectionately,

F. TEMPLE.

He accepted, though with some bitterness, the Inspectorship of Training Colleges:—

To Dr. Scott

KNELLER HALL, June 5, 1855.

. . . . I have accepted the Inspectorship of Training Schools. . . . I wish, however, to get out of the Government Service. I am not of the sort to get on. I don't attract. I do not mean to say that this is a merit. I do not mean that flattery or anything that way tending is needful. But there is a *je ne sais quoi* which must be used in approaching our present rulers, which I cannot learn. Only yesterday, when consulted by the Dean of Windsor about some detail of the new Wellington College, I said something which made him laugh, and exclaim: "*You would never get on at Court!*"

From the following letter it may be gathered that he did not love his work:—

October 30, 1855.

I have begun my new duties, and I can hardly tell you how much I dislike them.

He did the work with diligence, nevertheless ; his duties took him much about the country, and incidentally at least there was happiness :—

To his sister Netta

WINCHESTER, June 17, 1856.

We have pretty well finished here, and to-morrow I go on to Chichester. This place is enough to make one rave. The sense of beauty, of quiet, of religiousness is almost overpowering. I have just been walking over to St. Cross. The grand old Church in the most perfect style of Norman architecture, the nicely kept grounds, the beautiful trees, the situation in a quiet valley with the clear Itchen a little way off, and the chalk hills with the white gleaming out here and there in large patches on their sides. . . . I am afraid if I lived here I should become very idle. I should do nothing but wander about under beautiful avenues, beside sparkling waters (I never did see such bright waters), across deep meadows.

But he was ill at ease ; his past experience had filled him with a somewhat unreasonable bitterness against public men. He had expected of them to put themselves out of the way in favour of a system which could not be weighed in the balance for an instant against what they considered the larger interests of the country. Naturally they had not responded, and for a time he was out of conceit with the politicians, as to a certain extent he had become with the clergy. Moreover, to his mind there were certain inherent defects in the educational system which he had administered. He always believed in bringing national education into touch with the people, and, from the first, supported local action. But the basis of the work of

the Education Department was centralisation, and this he did not love.¹

Above all, there was a sense of failure. The visions and enthusiasm had not been realised, and the iron was entering into his soul. It was therefore a relief when the vacancy in the head-mastership of Rugby opened a door for him. God had sent him the great opportunity of his life. Rumours of preferment were already in the air: newspapers had named him for the Bishoprics, first of Salisbury and then of Ripon. Having regard to his own future the following letter has a special interest:—

To Dr. Scott

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT,
October 6, 1856.

Had there been any truth or likelihood, to my knowledge, in the report which gave me the Bishopric of Ripon, you would have been assuredly the first to get authentic information. The whole arises from a mere guess, hardly a guess, of the *Daily News*. The *Morning Advertiser* on Friday week asserted that there was a great danger of a very bad appointment to the See of Ripon; it went on to describe the obnoxious person as recommended by Lord Lansdowne, as completely secularised by working at schools and examinations, as having no real religious opinions but a pretended friendship for men of all parties. Thereupon the *Daily News* remarked, that being ignorant who was meant, it could conceive the person indicated to be the Rev. F. Temple, and if so it would be difficult to conceive a fitter person, etc., etc. Hence all the report; and the only reason it does not die away is that no other name has been mentioned. Whom the *Morning Advertiser* really meant I cannot tell; . . . but at any rate it is tolerably certain that I was never thought of. And

¹ *To Mr. Palgrave*

January 11, 1865.

I am not dead against Government action in middle class education, provided only the Government action be like that of the Poor Law Board, local and not central. But I do think central action mischievous, and that all the good done by the Council Office in elementary education is almost neutralised by its central character.

the *Daily News* has since been urging the necessity of appointing some man of declared views. I know well what to expect from you in such an event. Earnest prayers and good wishes; steady and affectionate advice; every aid that I can ask; but also expectations, which make me shrink. You know me well enough to know the sort of mixed feelings which the report has caused. I cannot deny my wish to labour in a freer position. But, God knows, I am far enough from seeking such an office as a Bishopric must be to me if ever I am put into one. I think that the report is so improbable that it is hardly worth while to weigh the chances and determine what I should do if it turned out true. Yet naturally enough I have not been able, indeed I do not know that it would have been quite right, to banish the thought from my mind. Of this at any rate I feel sure, that I have not changed my opinion of what a Bishop could and ought to do; though thinking of it has made me much doubt whether I am the man who could attain that standard, or even so approach it as not to be a reproach to it. God bless you, my dear Scott, for all your kindness, but, above all, for not forgetting something higher than friendship when you write to me.

The Rugby headmastership was a real possibility, and it was necessary for him to bestir himself; but he writes:—

To Dr. Scott

September 7, 1857.

I do not mean to read my own Testimonials, and Walrond undertakes collecting them.¹

It was a fight for him, as were most things in early days:—

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT,
September 9, 1857.

What names a man gets if he comes out into the light! I have just had a list of the accusations made against me in the ears of the Rugby Trustees:

1. I am a Puseyite.
2. I am a Rationalist.
3. I know no Greek.

See "Rugby" Memoir, vol. i. p. 153.

4. I have no experience in teaching.
5. I am not a gentleman.
6. I failed at Kneller Hall.

But I think I shall succeed for all that.

The last objection raised against him was met by the Government minute made when Kneller Hall was closed.¹

Mr. Temple had not seen eye to eye with his chiefs at times, but few of his testimonials² were higher than those from Lords Lansdowne, Russell, and Granville, each of whom, with the instincts of a statesman, saw in him the material out of which great public servants are made, and anticipated a high future for him. Lingen and Sandford wrote in his favour, with the fuller knowledge of colleagues in the office. Both were Balliol men; the former, one of Temple's most intimate friends to the close of the Archbishop's life; the latter, his future ally in the Committee-Room of the National Society, and in Educational Debates in the House of Lords.

Temple was elected Headmaster of Rugby on the 12th of November 1857. "I found," writes Temple to Scott, "on getting home that Tait had sent the news to my mother."

The discipline of the first years of public life had been severe, but they had not been thrown away. To the time spent in the Education Office was due, not only his exceptional power of dealing with affairs and men, but that mastery of detail which makes ideals serviceable, and, when combined with grasp of principle, forms the highest type of public man. The fact that Temple had perfect knowledge of the details of the work, but used them as master rather than servant, made him *facile prin-*

¹ See "Education Office" Memoir, vol. i. p. 107.

² See Testimonials in favour of The Rev. F. Temple. Printed by Spottiswoode & Co., London.

ceps of the educational authorities of his time. And he had learnt a higher lesson from the discipline—he had learnt to use it for the help of others. This was the comfort that he gave in after years to a young headmaster who was out of heart, because it seemed at the time as though his work had been a failure:—

Other people have had the same trial to go through. I have gone through it and got over it. When I was at Kneller Hall, for years I felt just as you do now. I was despondent and more wretched than I can tell. When I saw the death of any friend or contemporary in the newspaper, I envied him and wished it had been me. But it didn't last; in time it all passed away. It generally does pass away. One is brought through somehow, if one goes on doing one's best.

“Could anything,” says the relater of the incident, “have been more tenderly sympathetic than this voluntary self-revelation of the strong man's weakness to a poor brother suffering the like?”

CHAPTER III

POWER

Appointment to Rugby, the opportunity of Temple's life—The School's expectation—Temple's response—Temple in the fulness of his powers—Death of his mother and brother—*Essays and Reviews*—Hayman episode.

TEMPLE's life, and especially the earlier part of it, had its special strain and trials, but he was happy in some of his opportunities. Changes came to him at favourable moments, when the times were ripe, and when there was a special correspondence between the requirements of his own life and of the position which he was called upon to fill. It was so when he was summoned to the headmastership of Rugby. The inner condition of the school was healthy;¹ it was sufficiently staffed by masters of high character and exceptional ability; the boys at the head of the school, as he himself was always quick to testify, were of a kind that keeps a school steady, and maintains and raises moral standards. The legacies which Dr. Goulburn left were all of them helpful for the highest object of a school. Few men have had fuller cause for gratitude to their predecessor than the new Headmaster of Rugby. All that was essential in the traditions which had made the school, including those which centred in Dr. Arnold, had been left intact; and if the late Headmaster had sought to modify and in

¹ "Rugby" Memoir, vol. i. p. 154.

some respects to change them, he had been more successful in building upon them than in altering them. Rugby was still Arnold's and Tait's school, with fewer perhaps of some peculiarities to which Temple had taken exception when first asked to link his fortunes with Rugby as an assistant master, but with not a whit less religiousness of tone or moral soundness.

But for all that Rugby was waiting, eager to make the best of itself, conscious that it might do more with its present potentialities and past history. The numbers were small, compared with what they had been in Arnold's or Tait's time. Dr. Temple, with characteristic generosity, put down the decrease to the Crimean war¹—the same cause which had crushed Kneller Hall. The war was over, and the public schools were beginning to fill again—Rugby amongst the number; but at the time the turn of the tide had hardly been perceived—at any rate not by the masters. They were discouraged, and their discouragement was reflected on the school; and the world at large, taking its cue from Rugby talk, was disposed to think that the place was in a bad way, and that Dr. Goulburn was the cause. And the Headmaster himself did not speak in his own defence; he had too much of the gentleman in him to attempt any self-advertisement; he simply went on his way, trying to do his duty by the school, and, above all, to make his boys good Christians. He was content to regard himself as something of a failure (“I do not understand boys,” he said, though he understood them better than he fancied, and left unforgotten memories in the minds of many of them); and when he thought the time was come, he resigned, leaving it to others to tend the seed which he had sown, to widen the field and gather the harvest. Perhaps

¹ *Supra*, p. 577.

he did not understand all that was required of a husbandman, and did not always "sow in hope"; but the school had not lost hope, it knew that there was good stuff in it,—it was waiting for what was to come.

And Temple, when he came, went out to meet the expectancy; he read the attitude and he responded. Now for the first time he was his own master, free to act, free to develop himself, and to give all his powers to the development of others. Instead of politicians, always looking to see what way the wind blew, and regarding the interests over which Temple presided as matters of minor moment, he was serving a body of trustees with whom, since the days of Arnold, it had been a tradition to give the reigning master a free hand; instead of living in the official atmosphere of Downing Street, he was surrounded by young life, which fed his enthusiasm at every turn, and waited on by masters eager to catch his word and carry out his behests. The whole place made answer and leapt to its feet. The intellectual section of the scholars felt that restraints had been withdrawn; they were no longer half afraid to think, to question, and admire. But not to these alone but to all the boy-life of the place he spoke, and in a language which all could understand. It was not that he tried to ingratiate himself and to profess a proficiency in games which he did not really possess; but there was no mistake that he cared for the games, and was one in spirit with the players; and games or no games, it was evident that here was a real man, every inch of him, and a man who had once been a boy and had a bit of the boy in him still. And the school soon learnt to know that he was absolutely capable; the school army, of which they were so proud, was safe in his hands; if here and there an old tradition were changed the boys did not like it, because of the

conservative nature in all boys, but they knew that somehow or other it must be all right. Above all, from the school chapel there came a voice which was unlike any other that they had ever heard. Religion had always been to them, as represented by Goulburn, beautiful and august; but perhaps the service of God had been made somewhat too awful. A boy must have something of the saint in him if he were to attempt it; but now there was that in the very ring of the voice which brought home the consciousness that the service was for all. Faith was the response to the God who really lived, and was always loving and drawing them; it was obedience to a Saviour who had died and risen again for each of them, in whom they saw God and had communion with Him. Duty was the supreme law for all, which compelled their obedience and convinced them that, whether they obeyed or not, they must own its claims. Temple was not so much to the school a great Headmaster as an ideal personality, in whom was summed up all that a man ought to be.

And the fame spread abroad. The Headmaster's services were required on Education Commissions, and he became the leading spirit and chief authority upon them; his methods were recognised as the best educational methods of the day. Members of the Rugby staff were chosen as the headmasters of other schools; some were called to be chiefs of old schools which had a reputation to maintain; some were set to model new schools upon the lines which they had learnt at Rugby. Bradley went to Marlborough College, Benson to Wellington, Arthur Butler to Haileybury, Jex Blake to Cheltenham, Percival to Clifton, Charles Evans to King Edward's School at Birmingham, Kitchener to Newcastle, Phillpotts to Bedford; Scotland asked for Potts as the head of Fettes College.

And while Temple's influence thus spread he did not forget those who went from him. Benson was among the headmasters supplied by Rugby, and the long correspondence between the two future Archbishops, lasting for more than thirty-five years, begins with letters from Rugby giving advice to the new Headmaster at Wellington. Grave and gay are mingled, and personal touches enliven business.

To Dr. Benson

RUGBY, May 6, 1861.

How goes it with you? I hear of your not being well. If you overwork yourself I shall come to Wellington College the moment work is over here, and take all your Sixth myself. So take care. . . . The School is working well, and it is nonsense to say that it has lost public confidence, for the applications for admission are more numerous than ever.¹ Do write and tell me how you are, and how is your thumb (which has been unwell long enough to have acquired a distinct existence), and how is your wife, to whom I send my love, and how is my boy?—Yours, F. TEMPLE.

RUGBY, June 17, 1861.

The best remedy for small worries is to get into the Chapel when no one is there and give vent to them. *Experto crede*. Moreover, do try to cure yourself of the habit of looking to results. It is a bad habit, I assure you. Depend upon it, in the long-run, even if you have said and done the wrong thing, it is better than the right thing. I was quite delighted to hear that you had taken Hardy. If he finds it comfortable he is just your man. Far better than either my dodge or your dodge by how much a *man* is always better than *any* dodge.

RUGBY, July 27, 1862.

. . . I understand your silence. If you had determined to stand for Birmingham I should have certainly helped you with all my might. But I am glad that you did not consult me; and on the whole I am glad that you are not a candidate. . . . The pros and cons in such case are a matter of

¹ This has reference to *Essays and Reviews*.

sentiment. But I am sure that were I now precisely in your position at Wellington I should not stand for Birmingham ; and somehow one cannot comfortably advise friends one loves to do what one would not do oneself.

April 7, 1865.

. . . I have not seen Lygon's Bill. All depends on the exact terms of it. Can you not get it and bring it with you to-morrow week ? Then is time enough. I am looking forward to your coming. I shall like to have a talk with you. Only you do argue so fiercely that one is afraid to say what one thinks. Love to Mrs. Benson and *the Boy*.

RUGBY, October 25, 1868.

How goes your world ? And all your schemes and all your stewardship ? . . . You know that Goulburn preaches here on Wednesday at 11½. Is it conceivable that you should come and hear him ? You cannot think how welcome you would be. . . . I seem to have lost sight of you for ever so long ; which is good for neither of us. And I want to hear all about everything. I am meditating, dreaming, devising, scheming what I shall do with the Public Schools Act. The said Act will not stand still, I suspect. It will set other Acts rolling before long. And some of the coming Acts will not, I fear, be at all desirable. Are you eager to pull down the Irish Church ? It is the right line for a Conservative to take, I assure you : ask Hutchinson if it is not.

Nor were pupils forgotten. His correspondence with Dr. Scott, continued throughout the Rugby period, is full of references to individual scholars sent from Rugby to Balliol. It is remarkable that during the Temple headmastership Cambridge rather than Oxford was the University which found favour with the mass of Rugbeians, largely owing to the fact that some of the leading members of the staff at Rugby at the time were Cambridge men. Dr. Temple mentions the circumstance in one of his letters with some natural touch of regret ; but those who were destined for Oxford he follows with special concern, and commends them individually to Dr. Scott's care, whenever intended for Balliol.

with discriminating comments. In Scott's own son Walter he had naturally special interest—mindful of the debt of former days. There is scarcely a letter written during the son's time at Rugby which does not mention him. Dr. Temple was too busy a man to have leisure for that full correspondence with old pupils which give so great a charm to the relations with them of Dr. Arnold and Professor Jowett, nor had he a natural aptitude for letters of this kind—it was not in his way to write them. His letters to old scholars were for the most part few and far between, but when they came they were always greatly prized, either because of their pithiness and condensed affection, or sometimes because, perhaps all unexpectedly, they contained a long and well-reasoned dissertation on some matter of public interest. Here is a letter written to one of his favourite pupils during his undergraduate course, speaking of the Balliol of old days:—

RUGBY, *November 21, 1860.*

DEAR —,—I was glad to see your handwriting and gladder to find that you still remember us.

The scholars' table that you speak of seems to me a very good thing. I remember the scholars' table at Balliol with delight. There, I think, I found such social pleasure as I have never found beaten since. The mistake of —, however, has not been an original want of *esprit de corps*. It had once as much as —, but the College gave itself up body and soul to the study of mathematics. And a mere mathematical college will never stand its ground against one that takes to more human studies. Say what they will, the men of mere science are the hewers of wood and drawers of water for the men of politics and philosophy. Ἀρχιτεκτονική τις τέχνη ἢ πολιτική, and if the — wish to hold their own they must take more to the classical, less to the mathematical tripos. If — would open her fellowships to the whole University, and give them by an examination which should go beyond even your classical tripos into classical literature,

history, and philosophy, it would beat — out of the field in twenty years. But . . . Shakespeare readings and rifle corps will not do what they want. Come here by all means if you can. Miss Temple will not be here on Tuesday week. But I shall, and either then or at any other time shall be delighted to see you.—Yours ever affectionately,

F. TEMPLE.

And here is another, written twelve years later, giving his impression of the senior Oxford men of later days :—

NANSLADRON, ST. AUSTELL,
July 4, 1870.

MY DEAR —,—I went to Oxford. . . . They had a grand dinner and all sorts of fine things. But I was much struck by the pervading melancholy of the older men. They looked as if Oxford were no longer for them nor they for Oxford, and that all was fast going the wrong road. Much as I differed from their views I could not help being touched by their sadness. They love Oxford (as none can fail to do who belong to Oxford), and they feel that Oxford is parting company with them.

And this is his impression of the politicians of the time. His judgment is more favourable than it would have been in the Kneller Hall days; perhaps a change in his own position inclined him to look with kinder eyes.

January 7, 1868.

. . . I am much struck with the serious faces and deep sense of responsibility which I see in all the politicians that I meet now. It is good for them, no doubt. But though I know it ought to be so, I did not quite expect till I came up here to find that it was so.

Here is a memorandum following a line of thought pursued more fully afterwards in his Bampton Lectures. Very possibly it recalls the turn which the talk took in the course of a long

walk, and it illustrates the kind of way in which the mind of his more thoughtful pupils was developed :—

There is much in men's minds as well as in their bodies which is mechanical and subject to laws imposed on them by nature. But the will is not so subject.

This is proved by the consciousness of the broad distinction which we invariably draw between our own acts as moral and, therefore, free beings, and the movements of all material substances. This distinction is not only broad but deep, and the more we consider the subject the more are we convinced that we are separated by ineradicable differences from all the material world. It is proved still further by the sense of responsibility. I know that I am responsible for my actions. I know that the cloud which crosses over my head is not responsible for its movement. Why? Because the movement is impressed on the cloud from without; the action of my will comes from within.

The analogies of physical science, therefore, cannot penetrate into the spiritual kingdom. The philosopher may reduce much of human life under law, and call his science psychology. But psychology shows no tendency to include theology as one of its divisions, and if all else be mechanical the choice between right and wrong never can be, since, if so, right would cease to be right, and conscience would be a delusion. And even if the philosopher were to reduce history to law, still human will would not be proved mechanical; for the limits of individual action are so infinitely small in comparison with those of national action, that if the national movement were mechanical, the movements of the individual will might still be free, as they would only produce a vibration in the wheels of the machine.

It follows, therefore, that no difficulty raised by physical science can interfere with prayer for spiritual blessings to be bestowed either on yourself or on others. God has not made any revelation of a determined course of action in this matter. We never can feel that we are asking Him to set aside a rule of His own government here. A man must have philosophised away his wits before he can say science proves that my conduct is under a fixed law, and it is therefore useless to pray God to help me to alter it.

But more than this follows.

For all that part of physical phenomena which is capable

of being affected by human action, is *pro tanto* taken out of the mechanical dominion of law.

Let us suppose that the weather in England can be affected by some man lighting a fire and burning down a huge forest in South America.

Let us suppose that the spread of an epidemic is affected by the conduct of men in dealing with it.

Let us suppose that the energy of the farmers has an effect on the crops.

Let us suppose that the power of a disease is affected by the temper or other mental condition of the patient.

In all these cases it is obvious that the phenomena are taken away from the *absolute* dominion of law, and are so far no longer the subjects of a revelation that God will only act in one way.

Every man must determine for himself how far this will carry him. I am convinced that we are meant to pray for spiritual blessings, and that by prayer we get them. I shrink from praying for any other blessings except in a very general way. But the above remark is enough to show that others beside spiritual blessings *may*, in the present state of science, be possibly the proper matter of prayer on the part of those who do not feel so deeply impressed as I do by the tendency of science to subordinate all physical phenomena to law.

In the two following letters he cheers the heart of an old pupil who had become one of the Rugby staff:—

RUGBY, *June 29, 1867.*

MY DEAR ———,—If you are disheartened and unhappy I cannot say any more. Though I am sure that your resignation is not good for the school, it may be best for yourself.

But I should be wrong if I did not protest against the principle on which you are acting. You set up a simply impossible standard of results, and because you cannot reach it you throw up your work.

If your principle were sound there is not one master here who ought to stay; and most assuredly I ought to have gone after one year's trial.

Do you suppose that the Sixth is at all what I desire? Do you suppose that it is a light matter to me that so many of my pupils should turn out so ill or, at any rate, so poorly at Oxford? I can tell you that it has often been with bitter

pain that I have decided that, on the whole, I ought to stay. For I know that poor as the results are, yet on the whole there is no reasonable evidence that another man would attain to greater. And such work must not be thrown away lightly.

Your influence has not taught your pupils to be perfectly straightforward. And what right had you to expect that you would achieve such a miracle by this time? Or what other master has achieved it better?

If you must go, I am in duty bound to tell you that you go for your own sake and not for that of the school.—Yours affectionately,
F. TEMPLE.

RUGBY, *June 29, 1867.*

MY DEAR —,—I entirely believe in your unselfishness. I am quite certain that you only desire to do what is right. But I cannot alter my opinion. I am sure that you are doing what, as far as the school is concerned, is a great mistake.

Your resignation will make an impression on your pupils, I have no doubt. But I know boys better than you do. Their characters are very rarely deep; depth comes later. And single great acts have not the same effect, cannot have the same effect, on a mass of boys as patient perseverance. You will assuredly make no such impression on them as to compensate for the very heavy loss that your going away will be. I have no hesitation in saying that there are *very* few masters whose departure I should consider as so great a loss.

I beg of you, as a matter of duty, to leave this undecided till we break up.—Yours affectionately,

F. TEMPLE.

The affection lying hid under the frank and incisive tone of these last letters is manifest, and they are revelations of the depth of self-introspection and misgiving which was concealed by the courageous front of his daily life. Here are two letters which show that he could follow his pupils with sympathy in different callings of life, and that he held them long in his memory. It may be hoped that Dr. Temple's counsels as to teachers being in Holy Orders may still have weight:—

THE PALACE, EXETER,
March 22, 1871.

MY DEAR WERE¹—I never advise any man to seek Orders unless he feels a decided wish for it. If a man is well fitted for it, his being ordained is a blessing both to himself and to others. But I know nothing sadder than that a man should take such a step and afterwards regret it. But if a man desires ordination I certainly think that teaching the young is as proper an employment for an ordained minister as teaching the grown up, which is the chief business of the parochial clergyman.

An unordained man can teach boys, no doubt, and can give them religious teaching. But I am quite satisfied that if ordained he will do the same work better. On all religious questions boys will listen to a clergyman more willingly because they have a sense that he speaks with more authority. You say that laymen prepare for Confirmation as well as clergymen. I am sure that you are mistaken. No doubt a tutor who knows boys, though a layman, will do more for them than a stranger, though a clergyman. But the same tutor would do still better if ordained.

And in the daily hourly intercourse between boys and masters the work and influence are (insensibly, perhaps, yet none the less) really deeper and more religious when the masters are ordained.

If you desire to be ordained, I certainly think school work a very proper employment for you when in Orders.—
Yours affectionately, F. EXON.

LAMBETH PALACE, S.E.,
November 22, 1899.

MY DEAR CARTWRIGHT²—Many thanks for your most interesting letter. I know nothing more remarkable in history than the warmth of affection shown by the great colonies and dependencies of the Crown to the mother country at this juncture.³ It is new, and unmistakable, and fervent. And it bears witness to the justice with which England endeavours to rule in these present days. The spontaneous burst of strong affection from Canada in the north-west and Australia in the south-east is a glory to this country which astonishes all the world.

¹ Bishop Suffragan of Derby.

² James S. Cartwright, Esq., K.C., Ontario.

³ The South African War.

I have not forgotten early days at Rugby, nor the Sixth which I found at the head of the school when I came, nor you who were then among them. And I rejoice to think that you still remember the old Headmaster. I am old now and not equal physically to what I was then. But my heart still warms to Rugby and old Rugbeians.—Yours affectionately,

F. CANTUAR.

James S. Cartwright, Esq.

Dr. Temple did not write often, and his affection was not demonstrative; but his interest in boy-life was one of the strongest elements in his character. It is impossible not to recognise the reserve of deep feeling disclosed by such a letter as this:—

RUGBY, *April 8, 1863.*

MY DEAR BENSON—The poor little boy died this afternoon at three. He suffered much, but it is pleasant to think that his last conscious effort of mind was to pray, and when he found that he had not self-command enough for that he folded his hands and whispered, “In God’s hands, God’s hands.”

His father, mother, and sister came here at five.

The father has since told me that among his things left behind him when he came to school this time, his mother found a prayer in his own handwriting that God would help him to be a better boy at his lessons.

I know all this will not be pain to you to read, and it is a relief to write it.—Yours,

F. TEMPLE.

The fact that the following memorandum relates to a grandson of Dr. Arnold lends additional interest:—

In November 1865 there were three very serious cases of typhoid fever among the boys in the Schoolhouse, one of which proved fatal.

The first to be taken ill was E. P. Arnold, the adopted son of Dr. Temple’s old friend, Mr. W. E. Forster. As soon as the illness declared itself, Dr. Temple and his sister sent away their young nieces and nephew, and the Doctor himself carried the sick boy—as indeed he always carried him whenever it was necessary at each stage of the illness and

convalescence—into “the old nursery” in their own private part of the house. Trained nursing was scarcely organised in those days, and Miss Temple shared untiringly with the boy’s mother both by day and night in all the very severe nursing, until she was obliged to devote herself wholly to the two fresh cases in the sick-house.

Mrs. W. E. Forster in her journal tells in full the story of her boy’s four weeks’ illness and of his unlooked-for recovery when hope was so completely gone that twice Dr. Temple had read the last prayers over him. At the close, in summing up the memories of this time of “deep trial and wonderful deliverance,” she writes: “The generous and large-hearted sympathy and hospitality of the Temples can never be forgotten. Their house was turned into a hospital for an infectious fever—all the children turned out of it—and yet such was their completeness of sympathy that one felt as if the concern was their own as well as ours.”¹

There is the same touch of tenderness in a scene of later years described by Robert Lawson. The daughter taken away was Dr. Temple’s godchild:—

It was made known to the Bishop that our dear child’s life was very near its close. Full of work though he was, he came to us at once by night, and went up straightway to her little bed, and bent over her with words of soothing and love, and then knelt by her side. It was pathetic to see the little one’s thin pale hand wandering through his black hair, while his tenderness was like that of a loving mother, only more touching: tears fell on her pillow as he blessed her and bade her good-bye.²

The Rugby days were emphatically the days of Temple’s power, and the people offered him “free-will offerings.” He was the embodiment of force in the fulness of strong manhood. To the devotion shown him he responded by giving to the work all that was in him, and all the environment

¹ Memorandum supplied by Miss Frances Arnold-Forster, Wharfeside, Burley-in-Wharfedale.

² Memorandum supplied by The Rev. J. B. Hughes, Vicar of Staverton, Devon.

drew him out. The school and the master reacted on each other. He was *inside* the life which he was called upon to direct, and the attitude of his mind towards it was not critical but sympathetic. All around him, whether in boys or masters, was alert, eager, hopeful; the physical powers fresh, the intelligence responsive; and Temple, while he guided the onward push, went along with it. He was a leader *amongst* his men. All that was progressive in him, both in theology and politics, stretched itself to the full. It was a great time for him and the school. No wonder that those who were under him and with him, and some of them very close to him, look back upon those days and say, "It was then that we truly lived"—no wonder that the memory is also a hope, and that some who are growing old, in thinking on those days, grow young again, and take heart and look forward.

But it was not a time without its dangers to the central figure; it needed discipline, and without that he might have yielded to some of the temptations which befall unchastened power. The discipline came, some of it in the natural ordering of life. His younger brother—the "Johnny" of Tiverton days, whom he had watched, befriended, loved so tenderly—was drowned in India. He writes simply about the incident to Dr. Scott; but the communication with India was not then as speedy as now, and the suspense aggravated a pain which in itself was great:—

To Dr. Scott

2 BELGRAVE TERRACE, BRIGHTON,
January 18, 1867.

MY DEAR SCOTT—I very much^d fear that I have lost my brother. The telegraphic news from the *Bombay Mail* is so circumstantial; there is no other Colonel Temple in the Indian army; the river Adgar is said to be so likely a place

for such an accident ; the people he was said to be with are so likely companions—altogether I fear that the news is all but certain.

The waiting for details, and for certainty is very hard to bear.—Yours affectionately,
F. TEMPLE.

RUGBY, February 1, 1867.

. . . I have had letters from India about my dear brother. It was all true—a mere accident. The boat ran on a bank, then shoved off, and then (too late) was discovered to have been damaged and to be filling. It is impossible not to feel a vain sort of longing that such a trifling accident might have been prevented. But perhaps it is all the more clearly God's will.

The blow came on the top of the sorrow caused by the death of his mother, which had taken place some months before :—

To Dr. Scott

May 1, 1866.

I am in great anxiety and more than anxiety just now. My mother is very ill, and I fear that the chances of her recovery are very slight. Day by day she becomes visibly weaker ; and what that is at her age, you know. Last week she herself thought that she should not live out the week ; one day she thought that she should not live out the day. But though that feeling has passed away she seems to me not better, but worse. And the doctor does not believe that there is any real hope.

She lingered with him for a week longer :—

May 5, 1866.

My dear mother still lives and that is all that I can say. She is very quiet, perfectly resigned, absolutely at peace. I feel just now as if her death would leave me nothing more to live for. But that I know will pass away by God's mercy.

Three days later she died :—

To Dr. Scott

May 8, 1866.

It is all over and my dearest mother is gone away. In the last few days there was so little change that in spite of

everything hopes were creeping back in our minds. But last night about half-past twelve my sister came to me not so much alarmed as uneasy at the tone of her voice. I went at once, but before I had reached the room she had lost consciousness, and in a few minutes she passed very quietly away. I do not think that she herself expected her death so soon. But she was throughout so trusting, so loving, so ready to be in God's hands that I could not have wished this otherwise.

In his letter telling Dr. Benson of her death, he adds something as to what she had been to him :—

To Dr. Benson

RUGBY, May 8, 1866.

It has pleased God to call away my dear mother. She died last night about half-past twelve. It is impossible to imagine any one more resigned, more childlike, more full of love and trust than she was in her last days. And she was so happy in the thought of going to the Lord that I cannot wish that He had not called her from us. Yet I feel it a very heavy blow. I have never been long parted from her ever since I was born, and for the last twenty years she has lived in my house, and life does not seem the same without her. Very few mothers can be to their sons what she has been to me —Yours ever,

F. TEMPLE.

But all this came in the ordinary course of life. The incidents which tried him most sorely were of a different kind. First among them was the storm about his participation in *Essays and Reviews*. It was renewed nearly ten years later on his appointment to the See of Exeter.

The circumstances in each case have been given elsewhere.¹ Something must be added as to the genesis and character of the book and of Dr. Temple's own contribution to it. On the former

¹ See "Rugby" Memoir, vol. i. pp. 219-226 and "Exeter" Memoir, vol. i. pp. 280-306.

point a letter to Canon Cook, written in 1869 before he went to Exeter, is the best comment :—

There was a series of essays published in several successive years called the *Oxford Essays*. In that series I wrote, and so did Max Müller, Maine, etc. It came to an end simply because it was intended as a vent for what several of us wanted to say, and we had no more to say.

It was then suggested that it should be followed by a series (not a volume only) on religious subjects. I liked the idea, and I liked particularly the opportunity that it would give for speaking out. It appeared to me that at that time there was prevalent amongst the clergy a most unwholesome reticence. I believed that this publication might serve to break through it. I knew that startling things would be said ; but I believed that it would be worth while that they should be said. . . .

I asked, before I agreed to write, what the probable line would be. I was told that it would be in the Liberal direction, but strictly within the limits allowed by the Church of England. I made no stipulation in the matter ; for indeed the disclaimer of mutual responsibility which was to be prefixed seemed to me to make it unnecessary. I did not even ask who was to be the editor ; and did not know till he wrote to ask me for my paper. There was neither plan nor organisation. The *Oxford Essays* had suggested the publication. And these new essays were supposed to be, and as regards composition actually were, as independent of each other as the different papers in the *Oxford Essays*.

Now, no one supposed that these papers would live. They were not of that texture. I wrote my essay in less than ten hours : a man who was taking part in a serious organised attack on existing opinions would have never dreamt of effecting anything by a ten hours' production.

The relations in which the individual authors stood to the book is stated in the preface :—

To the Reader

It will readily be understood that the Authors of the ensuing Essays are responsible for their respective articles only. They have written in entire independence of each other, and without concert or comparison.

The Volume, it is hoped, will be received as an attempt to illustrate the advantage derivable to the cause of religious and moral truth, from a free handling, in a becoming spirit, of subjects peculiarly liable to suffer by the repetition of conventional language, and from traditional methods of treatment.

Dean Stanley when asked to contribute an essay declined. It was not that he was more definite in theological view than Dr. Temple—far from it—but he questioned the expediency of such a publication under such conditions and at such a time. Afterwards, when the storm arose, he threw himself on behalf of his friends with characteristic chivalry into the fray. Dr. Temple, however, was less prudent. Questions of the expedient were never prime considerations with him, and in earlier years had even smaller place in his mind than afterwards. He held himself absolutely responsible for his own essay; for the others only in the limited sense indicated by the preface; from this position he never swerved.

His contribution—'The Education of the World'—was based on the supposed analogy between the life of the individual and the life of the human race. In each were three stages: childhood in the individual corresponded with the period in the world's history previous to the coming of Christ; youth and early manhood corresponded with the years of the Lord's sojourn upon earth and the generation immediately succeeding it; full manhood and old age had their counterpart in the centuries which had followed since Christianity was young. In each case the teacher for the first period was external authority (that of legal system for the race, of parents and governors for the individual): in each case the teacher for the second period was example (the example of Christ for the race, of companions and contemporaries for the individual):

in each case the teacher for the last period was the inner guide (the Holy Spirit of God speaking by the voice of conscience). That the analogy itself is fanciful, and that the principle of analogy cannot be applied in this positive way, may be fairly maintained; but the general line of the essay will commend itself to those who believe in a gradual ascent of man, in accordance with which he passes from a system of external to internal government; and it is the position naturally taken by one who, while accepting to the full the doctrines of Christianity, had drunk deeply of the religious philosophy of Kant and Coleridge. Here and there in the essay were unguarded expressions, which would not have occurred had the essay been less hastily written, nor have escaped the censorship of the author in later life; but few even then found serious fault with its teaching, and had it not been for the company in which it was found, its orthodoxy would not have been impugned.

The strong point of the essay was not its analogy or argument, but the glow of its language and the beauty of its tone, which may well be illustrated by the following paragraphs:—

The Early Church stands as the example which has most influenced our religious life, as Greece and Rome have most influenced our political and intellectual life. We read the New Testament, not to find there forms of devotion, for there are few to be found; nor laws of Church government, for there are hardly any; nor creeds, for there are none; nor doctrines logically stated, for there is no attempt at logical precision. "The New Testament is almost entirely occupied with two lives—the life of our Lord, and the life of the Early Church. Among the Epistles there are but two which seem, even at first sight, to be treatises for the future instead of letters for the time—the Epistle to the Romans and the Epistle to the Hebrews. But even these, when closely examined, appear, like the rest, to be no more than the fruit of the current history. That Early Church does not give us

precepts, but an example. She says, Be ye followers of me, as I also am of Christ. This had never been said by Moses, nor by any of the prophets. But the world was now grown old enough to be taught by seeing the lives of saints, better than by hearing the words of prophets. When afterwards Christians needed creeds, and liturgies, and forms of Church government, and systems of theology, they could not find them in the New Testament. They found there only the materials out of which such needs could be supplied. But the combination and selection of those materials they had to provide for themselves. In fact, the work which the Early Church had to do was peculiar. Her circumstances were still more peculiar. Had she legislated peremptorily for posterity, her legislation must have been set aside, as, indeed, the prohibition to eat things strangled and to eat blood has been already set aside. But her example will live and teach for ever. In her we learn what is meant by zeal, what by love of God, what by joy in the Holy Ghost, what by endurance for the sake of Christ. For the very purpose of giving us a pattern, the chief features in her character are, as it were, magnified into colossal proportions. Our saints must chiefly be the saints of domestic life, the brightness of whose light is visible to very few. But their saintliness was forced into publicity, and its radiance illumines the earth. So on every page of the New Testament is written, Go and do thou likewise. Transplant into your modern life the same heavenly-mindedness, the same fervour of love, the same unshaken faith, the same devotion to your fellow-men. And to these pages accordingly the Church of our day turns for renewal of inspiration. We even busy ourselves in tracing the details of the early Christian life, and we love to find that any practice of ours comes down from apostolic times. This is an exaggeration. It is not really following the Early Church, to be servile copyists of her practices. We are not commanded to have all things in common, because the Church of Jerusalem once had; nor are we to make every supper a sacrament, because the early Christians did so. To copy the Early Church is to *do as* she did, not what she did. Yet the very exaggeration is a testimony of the power which that Church has over us. We would fain imitate even her outward actions as a step towards imitating her inner life. Her outward actions were not meant for our model. She, too, had her faults: disorders, violent quarrels, licentious recklessness of opinion in regard both to faith and practice. But

these spots altogether disappear in the blaze of light which streams upon us when we look back towards her. Nay, we are impatient of being reminded that she had faults at all. So much does her youthful holiness surpass all that we can show, that he who can see her faults seems necessarily insensible to the brightness of her glory. There have been great saints since the days of the apostles. Holiness is as possible now as it was then. But the saintliness of that time had a peculiar beauty which we cannot copy ; a beauty not confined to the apostles or great leaders, but pervading the whole Church. It is not what they endured, nor the virtues which they practised, that so dazzle us. It is the perfect simplicity of the religious life, the singleness of heart, the openness, the childlike earnestness. All else has been repeated since, but this never. And this makes the religious man's heart turn back with longing to that blessed time when the Lord's service was the highest of all delights, and every act of worship came fresh from the soul. If we compare degrees of devotion, it may be reckoned something intrinsically nobler to serve God and love Him now when religion is colder than it was, and when we have not the aid of those thrilling, heart-stirring sympathies which blessed the Early Church. But even if our devotion be sometimes nobler in itself, yet theirs still remains the more beautiful, the more attractive. Ours may have its own place in the sight of God, but theirs remains the irresistible example which kindles all other hearts by its fire.

. . . The susceptibility of youth to the impression of society wears off at last. The age of reflection begins. From the storehouse of his youthful experience the man begins to draw the principles of his life. The spirit or conscience comes to full strength and assumes the throne intended for him in the soul. As an accredited judge, invested with full powers, he sits in the tribunal of our inner kingdom, decides upon the past, and legislates upon the future without appeal except to himself. He decides not by what is beautiful, or noble, or soul-inspiring, but by what is right. Gradually he frames his code of laws, revising, adding, abrogating, as a wider and deeper experience gives him clearer light. He is the third great teacher and the last.

Now the education by no means ceases when the spirit thus begins to lead the soul ; the office of the spirit is in fact to guide us into truth, not to give truth. The youth who has settled down to his life's work makes a great mistake if he

fancies that because he is no more under teachers and governors his education is therefore at an end. It is only changed in form. He has much, very much, to learn, more perhaps than all which he has yet learned; and his new teacher will not give it to him all at once. The lesson of life is in this respect like the lessons whereby we learn any ordinary business. The barrister, who has filled his memory with legal forms and imbued his mind with their spirit, knows that the most valuable part of his education is yet to be obtained in attending the courts of law. The physician is not content with the theories of the lecture-room, nor with the experiments of the laboratory, nor even with the attendance at the hospitals; he knows that independent practice, when he will be thrown upon his own resources, will open his eyes to much which at present he sees through a glass darkly. In every profession, after the principles are apparently mastered, there yet remains much to be learnt from the application of those principles to practice, the only means by which we ever understand principles to the bottom. So too with the lesson which includes all others, the lesson of life.¹

There are other passages of power and beauty, both in Dr. Temple's and in the companion essays, but in the latter case the general tone of thought is often open to exception, and in some instances the form of expression is coarse and objectionable, and was owned by Dr. Temple in letters to his friends to be very distasteful to him.² There is no doubt that the outcome of the book was to give the stimulus of a new spirit of inquiry within the Church, and though the Essays themselves were in some respects ephemeral productions—not intended by their writers to form part of the permanent literature of the subjects on which they touched—yet the results were more far-reaching than was anticipated. From the publication of the volume may be said to date the general introduction into the Church of England of the School of the Higher Criticism. Judgments on the book will differ

¹ See *Essays and Reviews*, "The Education of the World," pp. 28-32.

² *Infra*, p. 616.

according to the light in which that movement is regarded; those who see in it little but evil will hold that the day was evil in which it first was brought into prominence; others who think differently will say with Dr. Temple that on the whole the book did more good than harm.¹

The question of the advisability of Temple's co-operation in such a book is complicated by the consideration of his position as Headmaster of Rugby. "I will not purchase Rugby," he wrote to Robert Lawson on the eve of the election, "at the cost of my right to think for myself;" but afterwards he expressed doubts as to whether he had not pushed his personal liberty too far, when, after he had become Headmaster, he had not reconsidered his promise to write in *Essays and Reviews*.² The Rugby Trustees considered the question from this point of view:—

To Dr. Scott

The Trustees have been deliberating whether they should dismiss the Headmaster. The Headmaster declined to discuss with them any question but the welfare of the school. It has ended in a great growl, and for the present nothing more.

In declining to interfere the Trustees were mindful of the precedent which they had followed, usefully to the school, in Dr. Arnold's time. But the authorities of the Church did not stand in the same relation to Dr. Temple as did the Rugby Trustees. At a semi-formal meeting at the beginning of February 1861, the Bishops considered addresses and memorials which had been presented to them with reference to such questions as those raised by *Essays and Reviews*, and replied to one of

¹ Letter to Mr. Coleridge, October 11, 1860: see "*Exeter*" Memoir, vol. i. p. 285.

² See Speech to the Sixth Form at Rugby School. "*Rugby*" Memoir, vol. i. p. 220.

them by the hand of Archbishop Sumner in general terms of condemnation,¹ referring to the book as a whole, without discriminating between individual writers.

The Houses of Convocation followed suit, and after protracted debates, which were continued at intervals for several years, appended to the final Report, presented to Convocation June 21, 1864, which singled out certain passages² for animadversion, the following Resolutions as a synodical condemnation :—

That this Synod having appointed Committees of the Upper and Lower Houses to examine and report upon the volume entitled *Essays and Reviews*, and the said Committees having severally reported thereon, doth hereby synodically condemn the said volume as containing teaching contrary to the doctrine received by the United Church of England and Ireland, in common with the whole Catholic Church of Christ.³

It was not until June 21, 1864, that this Resolution was passed by the Upper House, and three days later (June 24, 1864) the Lower House concluded a well-nigh interminable debate by adding the following :—

That this House respectfully and heartily tenders its thanks to His Grace the President and the Bishops of the Upper House for their care in defence of the faith, and that this House does thankfully accept and concur in the condemnation of the book by the Upper House to which their concurrence has been invited by the Upper House.⁴

¹ See Letter of Archbishop Sumner, Lambeth, February 12, 1861. *Life of Archbishop Tait*, vol. i. p. 282.

² The following reference is made to Dr. Temple's Essay: "The Committee regret to add that the argument of the first essay (pp. 24, 25), by denying the probability of the recognition of the Divinity of our Lord in the more matured age of the world, appears to them to involve a similar denial of all miracles as historical facts: for it is asserted that 'the faculty of faith has turned inwards, and cannot now accept any outer manifestations of the truth of God'" (p. 24).—Chron. of Convocation, June 21, 1864.

³ Chron. of Convocation, June 21, 1864 (p. 1683).

⁴ *Ibid.* June 24, 1864 (p. 1830).

Two of the writers, the Rev. Rowland Williams, D.D., and the Rev. H. B. Wilson, B.D., were ultimately brought before the Court of Arches. Both were condemned on the charge of denying the inspiration of Scripture, and Mr. Wilson was also condemned for denying the doctrine of the eternity of punishment. Each of the defendants was sentenced to one year's suspension from clerical duties. On appeal the sentence was reversed by the Privy Council. It was not within the province of the Court to make any authoritative declaration as to the doctrine of the Church: the judgment of the Privy Council was based upon the principle that the defendants had not contravened the formularies of the Church as legally interpreted, so as to be worthy of punishment. Some days after the delivery of the judgment a great passage of arms took place between Lord Chancellor Westbury and the Bishop of Oxford, Dr. Wilberforce, in the course of which the celebrated lawyer made a characteristically caustic criticism on the Convocation judgment, of which document the Bishop was the accredited author. Dr. Temple did not believe in the justice of the censure passed by Convocation, but there never was a time in his life when he would have publicly sneered at a grave act of ecclesiastical authority: the censure of the Convocation and the Bishops was keenly felt, but it did not make him swerve. On the contrary, so fully impressed was he with the conviction that purely ecclesiastical tribunals could not be relied on to do strict justice to those who questioned accepted views, that shortly after the *Essays and Reviews* episode he joined a movement for raising funds to enable the Bishop of Natal, Dr. Colenso, whose book on the Pentateuch had been condemned by the Archbishop of Cape Town, to appeal from the judgment of his Metropolitan to the Privy

Council. But he felt the blow personally and was not without apprehensions for the school. How sensitive he was on the latter point may be judged from the eagerness with which in his letters to his friends he chronicles all signs of its continual welfare :—

To Dr. Benson

RUGBY, May 24, 1861.

The Low Church folk complain much that they do not find their views in my Discourses. What can I do?

We had 280 at the Communion on Sunday. It thrilled me all over.

To Dr. Scott

March 14, 1861.

The pressure upon me is heavier than ever, and 1866 is rapidly filling. I have of course lost some names; but more (and mostly sons of clergymen) come in. I am printing a volume of sermons which will, I think, satisfy Parents; but not the Record.

To Dr. Scott

RUGBY, May 6, 1861.

The Confirmation Service will begin at half-past ten. There are 184 candidates. I must try to persuade the Bishop to come every year in future.

The sermons to which he refers were those contained in his first volume of Rugby Sermons. They were his only reply to the clamour raised.¹

But it was a trying time, and his trouble was aggravated by the recurrence, as in the Kneller Hall period, of an attack of illness brought on by anxiety.

Harder than all to bear 'was the pain that he

¹ It appears that the suggestion that he should meet the outcry by the publication of his Sermons was made to him by Mr. Alexander Macmillan in the following letter, dated March 2, 1861: "The nature of the religious training you give your pupils at Rugby would be best seen in the Sermons you address to them. If you felt inclined to make a selection from those you have preached, and make a volume about the size of Dr. Arnold's *School Sermons*, or even as large as Dr. Vaughan's, we should have great pleasure in undertaking its publication and count it an honour to do so."

knew he was giving to his personal friends: amongst these Dr. Scott had a special place, and the thought that he was grieving him gave a special tone of sensitiveness to Temple's words:—

February 12, 1861.

I think that I have a little to complain of in your letter, because you put what must be a question of right and wrong as if it were a question of rival friendships. This is not a case, nor am I of an age, to justify me in putting myself into any friend's hands and doing what he might suggest. And assuredly, if it were a question of affection, I have never given you reason to believe that I should prefer any one's to yours.

But neither injured feeling nor ill-health prevented him from giving his friend the following thoughtful and detailed justification of his actions. He continues:—

This book which you call unhappy, an epithet in which I cannot join, is just entering on a theological storm. It is so unlike the ordinary teaching of this country that it has alarmed all those who cannot distinguish between essentials and accidentals. The alarm, as is usual with theological alarm, is exceedingly infectious. And very many who, left to themselves, would have taken the matter quietly and have endeavoured by calm thought to disentangle the good from the bad, are frightened by the terrified countenances of their friends into believing that the Christian religion is at stake. . . . And till this storm has passed there is not the smallest chance of quiet consideration of the subject.

If I believed that the book had an "infidel tendency" in the sense in which I understand the words, assuredly no considerations of chivalry or generosity would prevent me from disavowing my sympathy with it. But the fact is, that its tendency is infidel, in the sense in which Galileo was an infidel, in the sense in which my sermon last summer before the British Association was infidel, in the sense in which Dr. Arnold was an infidel. . . . I call a book infidel in tendency if it tends to rob us of the thought of God as our Creator and our loving Father, of the Son of God as our Redeemer from sin and the power which upholds all our religious life, of the

Bible as our spiritual guide. But I certainly do not call a book infidel because it refuses to shut up the discussion whether the Bible narrative is in all parts literally true. . . . Baden Powell is accused of explaining all miracles away. . . . But what he says is that to most, if not to all men who have studied Physical Science, the miracles in the Bible are objects of faith, not part of the evidence. I believe the miracles that I read of in the Bible; but most certainly if they came to me in any other book I should not believe them, not even if attested by precisely the same *external* testimony. To me they do not prove the truth of the Bible, but are proved by it. And how it is infidel to say this I cannot conceive.

There are statements in the book with which I very strongly disagree. One of the essays is most offensive in tone. But in dealing with such a book one must deal with it as a whole; and these matters of detail will not make the book either infidel or dangerous. . . . But if it has the effect of permanently lessening your friendship, God knows that it cannot bring on me anything much heavier after that.

I did not mean to answer your letter for some time. But I found myself unable to wait. Otherwise I am ill able to enter into any discussion just now. . . . But in another fortnight, if you want further knowledge of my opinions in any detail, ask any questions you like. I certainly do not undertake to answer everybody; but I will answer you. Only you must not be surprised to find that there are very many questions to which I must honestly answer, I do not know.—
Yours ever, F. TEMPLE.

A few days later he recurs to his usual tone of affection :—

RUGBY, February 19, 1861.

MY DEAR SCOTT—When I wrote last week I was very ill, much more ill than I knew. The fever brought back symptoms which eight years ago made three London physicians tell me that I could not expect to live out the year; *inter alia*, long fainting fits. This all passed off then, and I really believe that it has quite passed off now. But it rather shook me, as you may suppose. I have not ventured to tell my mother or sister *all* about it yet. Dear Scott, I feel all your goodness to me through and through.—Yours affectionately,

F. TEMPLE.

In his letters to his younger friend, Robert Lawson, there is the same touch of affection, with more freedom. The difference of opinion with Canon Lyttelton, to which reference is made, was the introduction, as in other cases, to a fuller friendship :—

RUGBY, *March 22, 1861.*

DEAR ROBERT—Thanks for Lyttelton's letter, which I return. I am sorry to have given pain to downright good men like Lyttelton. But I cannot help it. His letter is written in precisely the spirit against which I expressly wished to protest. My object in joining Wilson at all was precisely to show men like Lyttelton that I think them wrong.

God bless you, dearest Robert. Your friendship just now is more to me than I can tell.—Your most affectionate,

F. TEMPLE.

To Dr. Tait, then Bishop of London, his former pupil owed a great debt of gratitude, both for all that he had done for him in enlarging and training his mind when an undergraduate at Balliol, and also for the support given when he was a candidate for Rugby. It is not too much to say that this support was a supreme influence in bringing about the appointment. The two minds were cast in different moulds; but Temple entertained the highest respect for his senior, which he expresses in a letter written to Dr. Scott during the Archbishop's illness, on the eve of his own consecration :—

I am very sorry for the Archbishop. I have a most deep regard for him, and I doubt now if he will be spared to us.

It was with great pain that he found himself at variance with Dr. Tait on the subject of *Essays and Reviews*. As was usual in his case, personal regard gave an extra touch of intensity to the language which he used. A portion of the correspondence

is given in the *Life of Archbishop Tait*, and there is no need to repeat it here. If the words of Temple found in the recorded correspondence sound "fiercer" than those of Tait, it will be remembered that they were used by one who was fighting with his back to the wall, against great odds, in what was to him in some sense a matter of life and death. He had been wounded to the quick by the doubts cast on his loyalty to the Church and his Lord by a multitude which knew him not, and it seemed to him that he was not receiving all the support which he might have expected from the friend who had first set his feet in the path of liberal theology. Moreover, his sense of justice was offended by the determination of the Bishops to judge of the book as a whole, in spite of the disclaimer of the Preface, and by the concurrence of his friend in a condemnation based on this principle, after having told Jowett and himself as he, Dr. Temple, believed, that he saw nothing in their own Essays to condemn. Dr. Tait could not accept Dr. Temple's interpretation of what had passed between them on the subject, and it is evident that there was misconception. Before long, however, relations righted themselves, and when an attempt was successfully made to supplement the condemnatory letter of the Bishops by a synodical declaration on the part of Convocation, Dr. Tait opposed it with all the force at his command. Before the general controversy closed the former headmaster was penning the following entry in his diary from his old quarters in the Schoolhouse :—

SCHOOL HOUSE, RUGBY,
May 15, 1864.

I am sitting in our old bedroom. The room in which Catty, May, Craufurd, were all born. The room in which I lay for so many weeks in helpless sickness. All the old familiar sights are round me, as fourteen years ago. But

what changes in the living souls. . . . I am going to preach for the first time in that chapel for fourteen years and more. This morning I administered the Holy Communion to above 230 boys. A noble, cheering sight. O Lord, bless the work here. Bless Temple in his vigorous honest course. Deepen every religious impression of his teaching. Last night he addressed the communicants in chapel with great earnestness and plainness.¹

The two men, who more than once found their home in the same house and succeeded each other in more than one great position, had become friends once more, and the continuity of the friendship was never again broken.

The difference with Bishop Tait was intense while it lasted, but being the result of divergence of view as to the application of principles rather than as to principles themselves, it was soon over. In the case of Dr. Scott friendly relations were not strained to the same extent at the time, but the difference went deeper and lasted longer, making itself felt again when eight years afterwards the Bishopric of Exeter was offered :—

To Dr. Scott

RUGBY, October 7, 1869.

MY DEAR SCOTT—You will have heard that I have been offered and have accepted the Bishopric of Exeter. I write to ask for your affectionate prayers, which you know that I shall much need. I cannot help feeling much heaviness of heart at going from here. But it seemed to me a duty to go.—Yours affectionately,

F. TEMPLE.

This letter was apparently crossed in the post by one from Scott, to which the following is an answer :—

RUGBY, October 8, 1869.

MY DEAR SCOTT—Your letter cannot but give me much pain; more pain, I think, than you know by a great deal.

¹ *Life of Archbishop Tait*, vol. i. p. 324.

Yet I would rather have the pain than not have it. You could not have written so if you had lost all care for me. And I would have your affection even if it inflicted the worst of all pains to bear. That we should wish each other success in all that we aim at is no doubt impossible. What you wish for the Church and what I wish do not coincide, and perhaps may never coincide here on earth. What seems to me supremely right, looks to you quite wrong. And this will keep us apart, at any rate as far apart as you think right. Only, as I said yesterday, I will beg for your prayers. I will beg that you think of me often, and often ask God to bless what I do well and prevent all evil consequences of what I do ill, and give me daily more light to see where I am wrong and to go forward where I am right. While you pray for me I do not think I shall quite drop out of your heart,—Yours affectionately, ever and ever,

F. TEMPLE.

A correspondence follows, revealing difference of thought but showing the unity of spirit which lay beneath it :—

October 12, 1869.

MY DEAR TEMPLE—I am very, very sorry for the pain which my last letter gave you. Yet I do not think that there was anything in it that you must not have perfectly known before I wrote it.

As for its keeping us apart, I will only ask you whether, on me at least, it has had that effect hitherto? Certainly it has not been so from any wish or intention of mine. At any rate, you know that you have, and always will have, my prayers for you and for the Diocese. Though my last link of connexion with it was broken nearly three years ago, I have too many associations of love and duty with it to cease praying that your work may be for *unmixed* good in it. God bless you!—Ever affectionately yours,

ROBERT SCOTT.

To Dr. Scott

RUGBY, October 13, 1869.

MY DEAR SCOTT—I was thinking of writing to you again, chiefly moved to it by a letter from —, in which he spoke of "reports that had reached him." It is impossible quite to avoid misunderstanding. Somebody not long

ago expressed a belief that I doubted our Lord's Incarnation. Yet it so happened that just at the same time a young Unitarian who wrote to consult me confessed that he had always refused to hear me preach because so many had told him of my "passionate belief" in our Lord's Divinity. There is in the air, as it were, so much questioning and doubting just now that it is quite easy for men who have no intention to do so to misrepresent any one's opinions.

If your letter meant that you feel now the strong disapproval that you felt nine years ago, I certainly had no reason whatever to be surprised at it. If you have heard reports lately which seem to you to indicate a further divergence between us than there was then, I really think that they are groundless.

It is certainly with no pleasure that I go to this work if it be God's will that I am to go to it. I told Gladstone in plain words that I did not seek it at all, and was quite content to work on where I was for another ten years and then go to a Parish. Last year I was told, and I fully believed, that the two public speeches that I made on the Irish Church question would make it impossible for any Minister to give me any preferment. And my being told so after the first speech all the more encouraged me to make the second. But I hold my convictions dear. And I feel that they ought to be protected, and that I have no right to refuse a position which will enable me to protect them.

I believe that in those convictions I see the way to reconcile modern discoveries with the truth of our Lord's Gospel. I have no right to refuse a position where I can help forward such a purpose. I believe that this Church of England is one of the greatest blessings that God ever bestowed on any country. I see that it is fast loosing hold of the most powerful thinkers on the one hand, of the masses of the people on the other. I believe that something may be done to stop the mischief. I have no right to refuse to bear a hand if called upon to do so.

I say all this not to ask your agreement, but because at such a time I would fain be open, and not incur a judgment from you beyond what I deserve. Think as well of me as you can, dear friend. I am striving very earnestly to walk by the best light that God has given me. I am indeed,—Yours affectionately,

F. TEMPLE.

Date, probably October 14, 1869.

MY DEAR TEMPLE— . . . Let me assure you that I have not listened to "reports" about you. Do not think that I have ever doubted of your faith or goodness. Only remember that personal faith and goodness is one thing, and it is another that a loving friend should be able to rejoice in your becoming a Bishop. I am sorry to say that I do think you have identified yourself with teaching that is eating the heart out of the faith of others, even while you cherish your own faith as your soul's anchor,—and so I have come to the conclusion which has not given more pain to you than to myself. . . . God bless you.—Ever affectionately yours,

ROBERT SCOTT.

The incident ends with a letter from Temple :—

To Dr. Scott

RUGBY, October 21, 1869.

MY DEAR SCOTT—The stream of letters poured in upon me during the last week has been so overpowering that I could answer only those that I must. But I want nevertheless to send you one word of thanks for your assurance of your not having been intentionally cold. I confess that I had no idea that *you* thought *me* so, and I am really very sorry that I should have let it seem so. Most certainly I never felt it nor anything like it. I *must* manage somehow to see you more often. This cold ink and paper cannot be warmed, when there is so much to chill us that neither can help.—Yours ve affectionately,

F. TEMPLE.

Yet the two friends manage to throw warmth into pen and ink :—

EXETER, January 2, 1870.

MY DEAR SCOTT—Thank you more than my words or any words can say for your New Year's wishes. I enter on my work here with much anxiety, and with a great need of prayers. The parting from Rugby has been, as it has happened, a sharper pang than I have had to bear for many years, and I could not help bringing here a very heavy heart. But God's will be done in all things. Do not cease to pray for me often. I cannot tell you how much I feel the need of it.—Yours gratefully,

F. EXON.

It is pleasant to recall that, as in the case of the other old Balliol tutor, Dr. Tait, the friendship once renewed was never again interrupted. In the following summer Dr. Scott was preferred to the Deanery of Rochester. Dr. Temple was able to congratulate his friend with less reserve than when he had been made Master of Balliol, and with none of the pain which Scott had felt in regard to Temple's appointment to Exeter :—

To Dr. Scott

EXETER, *June 2, 1870.*

MY DEAR SCOTT—I am very glad indeed that you have had a token of appreciation, though I can well understand why it should be a struggle to leave Balliol. I wish with all my heart Rochester were farther west than it is. It is even more distant than Oxford.—Yours affectionately,

F. EXON.

PS.—The work here is very heavy; at present heavier than it was at Rugby.

Very soon the new Bishop is recurring to the new Dean for advice on Ritual :—

THE PALACE, EXETER,
March 22, 1871.

MY DEAR DEAN— . . . What do you intend to do about wearing the Cope? The Bishops are, I believe, to meet and settle what they will do. But I, for my part, would prefer at once obeying what appears to be the law in the matter. How people can be so disturbed in mind about a dress I cannot conceive; but inasmuch as they are so disturbed I see no way to quietness but simple obedience. Only it is, I think, a thing on which it is hardly right for a Bishop to act alone. 4

He thinks of the confirmation of his friend's daughter :—

March 22, 1871.

. . . I thought of Lilla on Monday. I was holding a Confirmation myself at Gwennap, not far from Redruth, and put her name into my prayers.

It will interest you perhaps to see the Form of Confirmation Service that I use here.

He asks that his nephew John Temple, a Woolwich cadet, may visit the Dean at Rochester and spend an occasional Sunday with him. And there is all the old touch of intimacy when he tells his friend of his approaching marriage in 1876 :—

EXETER, *August 2, 1876.*

MY DEAR SCOTT—I have found a Wife. I am engaged to be married to Miss Beatrice Lascelles, daughter of Lady Caroline Lascelles. I am sure you wish me well. The prospect makes me very happy.—Yours affectionately,

F. EXON.

The record of a lifelong friendship is well closed by the following letter :—

THE PALACE, EXETER,
January 10, 1885.

MY DEAR SCOTT—I have just seen in the *Times* the notice of the sad loss that has befallen you. I am old enough now to feel deaths no longer the terrible wrench they were. But yet the grief, though less violent, seems deeper, and the parting somehow a greater blow. I know how you must feel it, and my earnest prayers for your comfort from God's own goodness are from my very heart. It is years now since I saw her ; but I shall never forget her. Her genuineness, her directness, her simple uprightness, her strength of affection, her kindness—they seem to me greater now than even when I was often with her long ago. God be with you, my dear old friend, and believe that as for many years your name has never been absent from my daily prayers, now especially do I think of you and beseech God to help you.—Yours affectionately,

F. EXON.

But a more painful discipline for Dr. Temple than even the *Essays and Reviews* controversy, with its interruptions of close friendships, was the stir which arose about the appointment of his successor to the headmastership of Rugby. The Trustees of the school had forbore to interfere

with the Headmaster in regard either to his theological views or his political action; but it is evident that they had become uneasy on both subjects, and were minded, should the opportunity occur, to take such steps as might, if possible, dissociate the school of which they were Governors from that special liberal connexion which had attached to it from the days of Dr. Arnold. Counter influences were at work during the headmastership of Dr. Goulburn, but they had not sensibly affected the school, and during Dr. Temple's tenure of office it had, in the opinion of the Trustees, acquired more than ever a party reputation. In coming to this conclusion they made the mistake of judging the scholars from the masters, forgetting that there is a certain contrarieness in boy nature which disposes them to pull in an opposite direction if they conceive that the masters desire to influence them in matters which do not properly belong to their province; nor did they realise that the effect of Dr. Temple's own influence was not to make his scholars liberals, but—just what he intended—to train them to think for themselves. Nevertheless, the Trustees acted *bona fide*, and consulted the best interests of the school as far as they saw them. On the resignation of Dr. Temple their choice of a successor fell on the Rev. Dr. Hayman—formerly a Fellow of S. John's College, Oxford, and sometime Headmaster of Bradfield College—who was held to be sound in the faith as regards both theology and politics. It is not necessary to revive the details of the controversy which the appointment occasioned. The same credit for conscientious action must be claimed for Dr. Temple after the appointment was made, as is claimed for the Trustees in making it. Although he believed that the appointment was a blunder,

his first intention was to follow the natural course of loyally accepting his successor. Subsequently, however, he became so impressed by what he believed to be evidence of irregularities in the candidature, and of Dr. Hayman's unfitness for the post, that, after informing him of his intention, he wrote a private letter of remonstrance to the Trustees, stating his conviction that it would be impossible for the school to prosper under the new *régime*; and that so deep was his interest in its welfare that he was constrained to inform them of the conclusion to which he had come. The counsel was not taken, and the results which Dr. Temple had anticipated followed. During Dr. Hayman's headmastership a change in the constitution of the school, introduced by the Public Schools Act of 1868, took effect. One of the consequences of the change was to transfer the appointment of the Headmaster to a new body of Governors, on which educational interests were more directly represented; and the result, after several years of distressing friction, was the dismissal of Dr. Hayman by the new Governors. The case was referred to litigation, and it was decided by the Court of Equity that the Governors had not exceeded their powers in the dismissal of the Headmaster without reason assigned. In the course of the trial strictures were made by Vice-Chancellor Malins, the judge before whom the case was tried, on Dr. Temple's conduct. Opinions will differ on the general merits of the case. What is certain is that Dr. Temple acted throughout in accordance with his conscientious convictions. Judged by conventional standards his conduct will not be approved; but he believed that the case had passed beyond the range of ordinary rules, and was one of those excep-

tional cases to which they do not refer. He had too sound a judgment to multiply such exceptions; but he believed that now and again they occurred, and when he conceived that such a case had manifestly arisen, nothing on earth would deter him from acting on his convictions. The dark days at Rugby which followed the brilliant headmastership of Dr. Temple passed. He lived to see two members of his Rugby staff successively filling the post of Headmaster of the school—Dr. Jex Blake, the present Dean of Wells, and Dr. Percival, the present Bishop of Hereford; and when he died he had been himself, for more than ten years, Chairman of the Rugby Governors.

But the discipline of those two episodes had been severe, and there was discipline in what was to follow. The sequel of high hopes had been the failure of Kneller Hall; trial had waited upon the great success at Rugby; the crowning discipline was to be the call to fuller responsibilities.

CHAPTER IV

RESPONSIBILITY

Responsibility, a check and inspiration—in theology (Bampton Lectures)—in ecclesiastical and educational policy and attitude—Stability and restfulness.

“I DID feel certainly that the publication of one essay amongst others was a thing which might be allowed to Frederick Temple, but which was not therefore to be allowed to the Bishop of Exeter.”¹

These words form part of Dr. Temple's first speech in Convocation. They have been much misunderstood, and taken to imply that he was about to turn his back on his own past and abandon the cause of liberal thought. But they meant nothing of the kind²; they implied that henceforth he must think, speak, and act, not as one amongst others,

¹ Bishop of Exeter's Speech in the Upper House of Convocation, February 11, 1870, “Exeter” Memoir, vol. i. p. 303.

² One of the most striking illustrations both of Dr. Temple's self-command and of his lasting sympathy with liberal thought was afforded by the Report on the study of Holy Scripture which he wrote, when Bishop of London, for the Lambeth Conference of 1888. It anticipated conclusions now generally accepted by thoughtful men, which base the defence of Revelation upon sure foundations. The succeeding Conference endorsed many of these conclusions, but the rejection of the Report at the time held back for many years a cause which was dear to him, and he felt it much. He knew (as he told Archbishop Benson on another occasion, p. 665) how “to hold his tongue” when he thought silence right; the keenness of his disappointment was, however, well known to his intimate friends. Reference was made to the incident by Archbishop Davidson in the obituary tribute which he paid in Convocation to his predecessor, February 18, 1903.

but as one in a fuller sense than previously above others; and that in determining whether in any given case it was his duty to move in a Conservative or Liberal direction, this consideration must always have its weight. This understood, the words are a key to much of his life after he became a Bishop—higher position, greater authority, fuller and heavier responsibilities; and hence the need of calling into play *all* sides of his own mental sympathies. He became, not a narrower, but a larger-minded man. The responsibilities of a headmaster are, within their sphere, very full and direct; he stands to the young life confided to him *in loco parentis*. But the sphere of responsibility is contracted. Few areas are more self-contained than that of a public school, and few individuals more free to act on their own initiative than a headmaster. The world lies outside. A man of intelligence and breadth will take an interest in it, but of necessity the interest will be mental rather than emotional; the point of view will be external and the attitude critical. And in proportion as a man's personal gifts are great, the isolation will be increased. Such was the case with Dr. Temple at Rugby. Head and shoulders above both masters and boys, he was an absolute monarch, receptive doubtless, like all the best autocrats, drinking in influence and inspiration at every pore from the young life around him, but master of the influences even while he received them, and mainly conscious of responsibility only to himself and God.

At the Education Office the same detachment from the outer world operated. His relations to others were those of official life, and probably there is no class of men to whom it is so natural to take the external and critical view as the permanent official in a Government department, standing

above the general public on a superior pedestal, without the check of the thought of constituents, and outside the immediate control of Parliament. And towards the close of his time at Rugby it was becoming evident that there was some need of a steadying influence. It came in the form of the wider relationships of Episcopal life.

For as soon as he became Bishop all was altered. He was brought into contact with men and women of every age and condition of life. To all of them, in virtue of the special character of his office, he had responsibilities; with some of them he could only deal on equal terms; some of them were his superiors, if not mentally yet socially; and even those who were manifestly weaker and inferior had claims for different treatment than would have been accorded by the most indulgent of headmasters to his scholars. For the first time he had to make proof of S. Paul's words: "I am debtor both to the Greeks, and to the Barbarians; both to the wise, and to the unwise." A Christian bishop, of all men, must recognise that in Christ Jesus "there is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female; but all are one," and he is under obligation to all.

And for the rest of his life Bishop Temple set himself to master this lesson. Even when he was building upon and using the old principles, as was mainly the case, his manner of applying them and his methods of work were different. At every turn it was necessary to ask, not only is the thing right, but is it right for these people, at this time, and in this way? For weaker men such considerations often mean increased feebleness: to the opportunist they are a perpetual temptation; but to Temple, strong, self-reliant, and unworldly, the perpetual need of thinking of others was a salutary check. A man who could say of his own Univer-

sity, "Things cannot go on at Oxford at a faster rate than one-tenth of the velocity of the rest of the world," might be good at speaking the truth, but perhaps he could not always be trusted to speak it "in love." A subordinate who could chronicle a successful "fencing match with my masters" was good at thrust and parry, but might sometimes be too ready to draw his weapon. The friend who could write, "I have changed many opinions within the last ten years" (1844-54); "I may change many more, and perhaps back again, within the next ten," might be a very delightful friend, and ten years later a very good leader, but at the time the Church or an army would not be very safe in his hands. He was quite conscious of his own defects:—

To Dr. Scott

KNELLER HALL, *January 29, 1852.*

I am quite aware that my great defect in writing consists in my inability to enter readily into other men's views of the thing of which I am thinking. I do not readily conceive how it will look from their side, and I fear it makes me a little inclined to be intolerant sometimes, which is bad, of course.

I shall probably rewrite this production [a paper that he was writing—ED.], and, if you will let me, come with it to you in the summer for a week. Then you shall pick it to pieces.

RUGBY, *May 7, 1860.*

You need not encourage me to be obstinate in my own convictions. I am already tempted enough in that way.

But Rugby did not bring all the needed discipline. It was in "the care of all the Churches" that the strong man was subjected to those checks which made his strength yet more serviceable. Rugby was a field in which strength could freely expatiate; it was charged with calls which drew out the forces and powers of the character; but the wisdom which guides and moderates came with a yet more honourable sphere of labour.

Nor was it only as a check that increased responsibilities operated; they were an inspiration which influenced, toned, and raised the spirit, and which, by bringing him into larger relations with human life, called out new powers in him; they made him a fuller man. Especially, they evoked his sympathies and enlarged his heart. And this continuously and increasingly, as he was called from one Episcopate to another. At Exeter he was for the first time brought into close touch with the pastoral life of the clergy. In London his knowledge of men became yet wider and more intimate; he learnt to know clerical life on the side which directly appealed to his sympathies, and he was brought face to face with human life on its largest scale; he had to deal with the problems of our great cities, and he learnt to "have compassion on the multitude." The problem was handled, but not simply as a matter of economics: something of the spirit of the Good Shepherd passed into him. Perhaps none ever came to know the man's tenderness so fully as the London clergy. At his first coming amongst them he seemed to put on an extra amount of rough clothing; his raiment was veritable camel's hair. Dignified clergy went away offended, because neither in public meetings nor private interviews did they receive what they conceived to be their due measure of attention, and such of their letters as did not precisely require an answer appeared to go unheeded. But before long those who had best reason to know learnt the secret. The warm heart was revealed "in many different ways, and the eye which went with it was penetrating, and the action discriminating and wise. Lastly, when called to the Primacy, Dr. Temple came into fellowship with the whole Church, and through the cause of Foreign Missions his heart went out to the whole human family.

Several illustrations may be given of the influence upon him of enlarged responsibilities. One is to be found in Bishop Temple's Bampton Lectures.¹ When Dr. Temple abandoned the work of a tutor for public life, he gave up the prospect of becoming a great thinker or prolific author. His chief literary works are only three—his volumes of *Rugby Sermons*, his *Essay on the Education of the World*, and his *Bampton Lectures*. Allusion has already been made to each of these works; but it remains to add a few words as to the subject-matter of the last. The subject is the Relations between Religion and Science, and he deals with it, not from the point of view of a scientific expert, but as a clear-thinking man, knowing precisely what he means to say, and saying it earnestly, but with no waste of words. The language of the lectures is characteristically simple and direct, and there is no supplement in the way of appendix or note. The writer shows his acquaintance with Hegel, and later thinkers such as Mr. Herbert Spencer, but the inspiration comes from Kant and Coleridge. With his usual recognition of the limitations of human knowledge and the unwisdom of trying to go beyond them, the writer owns the futility of attempting to map out the exact terms of a reconciliation between the claims of Science and Religion; but taking the stand-point of a believer both in the one and the other, he maintains that such relations are possible. for Science and Religion are not destructive and contradictory of each other. The same principles are found in each. The principle of evolution, for instance, is as evident in the gradual development of religion as in the age-long process by which the natural world was created; the order and beauty and regular succession manifest in nature can be

¹ See "Exeter" Memoir, vol. i. p. 582.

traced also in the spiritual universe. Points in which revelation and science have been thought to contradict each other are found on closer study to be either not of the essence of revelation, or to be due to a misrepresentation of it; and that in revelation which formerly was held to be violation of law may one day be seen to be a revelation of a higher law; and in this case the uniformity of nature, which is the postulate of science, will be shown not to have been broken after all. But even if the uniformity of nature be not invariable, the violations of the law are now owned by believers to be so infrequent that it may be taken as a working postulate upon which science can proceed. Thus Religion and Science can enter into relations with each other; but the spiritual is supreme. The moral law is universal; it is the fullest and eternal expression of the mind and will of God, and as such it is never to be set aside, and whenever obedience to it is incompatible with obedience to the natural law, the moral claims allegiance:—

To bring the Moral Law under the dominion of Science, and to treat the belief in it as nothing more than one of the phenomena of human nature, it is necessary to treat the sentiment of reverence which it excites, the remorse which follows on disobedience to its commands, the sense of its supremacy, as delusions. It is always possible so to treat these things; but only at the cost of standing lower in the scale of being.¹

The voice within gives no proof, appeals to no evidence, but speaks as having a right to command, and requires our obedience by virtue of its own inherent superiority.²

Science ranks high, but:—

Nevertheless, it is not itself God; nor the highest revelation of God. . . . We know still that He is greater than all

¹ Temple's *Bampton Lectures*, pp. 60, 61.

² *Ibid.* p. 47.

that He hath made, and He speaks to us by another voice besides the voice of Science.¹

That inner voice is supreme, but it needs guidance and companionship, and it finds it in the Bible, which is God's external revelation, as conscience is His revelation within the soul. The Bible stands on a higher plane; it illuminates conscience, but it does not coerce it. They are allies, one of the other, interpreting each other, guiding each other, and into both is more of God's truth continuously poured, until God Himself is made manifest in Christ Jesus. He is the crown of the revelation which God has given us in His Word, and acceptance of Him is the test of the perceptiveness of the soul within.²

Much of this had been implied, if not actually said, in Dr. Temple's *Essay on the Education of the World*. The *Bampton Lectures*, in a sense, are the sequel to the contribution to *Essays and Reviews*. The Lectures, indeed, followed the line of all that he had previously said or written as to the interpretation of the Bible in relation to modern thought. Why, then, was it that former utterances had been judged unsound, and that the Bampton Lectures were recognised as aids to faith? Mainly, no doubt, because during the fourteen years which had intervened between the publication of *Essays and Reviews* and the delivery of Bishop Temple's Bampton Lectures, not a little of the teaching for which the former had been condemned had come to be regarded as compatible with belief in the Bible as God's revelation. The volume had, at any rate, rendered this service, that men could be owned as believers without being called upon to accept every incident in the Old Testament as literally true, or to pledge themselves to a belief in

¹ Temple's *Bampton Lectures*, pp. 32, 33.

² *Ibid.* p. 247.

the eternity of punishment in the sense in which that doctrine had been formerly received.

But the difference of attitude towards the two works was partly due to the fact that the sense of fuller responsibilities had exercised its influence. That which Dr. Temple now said was dissociated from writings in which the stress had been laid on the negative and not on the positive side. To many readers of *Essays and Reviews* it seemed that the main object of the majority of the writers had been destructive and not constructive—to state not what they conceived to be the essential truths of the Bible, but what they regarded as its imperfections—to emphasise the human and not the Divine element contained in it. It may have been better, on the whole, in the interests of truth, that the book should have been written; it was *certainly* better, in the interests of religious liberty, not to require a repudiation of the views of others uncondemned by the Law Courts, as a condition precedent to consecration to the Episcopacy. But Bishop Temple surely judged rightly of the obligations imposed by fuller responsibilities in withdrawing from partnership with such a work after he became Bishop; and the acceptance of his *Bampton Lectures* as a work making strongly for religious beliefs, was largely owing to the fact that in them he spoke by himself, and that his strong faith could tell its own tale.

Another reason for the different view taken of his later work was that fuller responsibilities acted as a check upon unguarded statements, and somewhat altered the tone of what was now said. Some other form was found for such statements as this:—

Had His revelation been delayed till now, assuredly it would have been hard for us to recognise His Divinity; for

the faculty of Faith has turned inwards, and cannot now accept any outer manifestations of the truth of God.¹

Still more certain is it that no such utterance can be dreamt of in connexion with his Bampton Lectures, as that with which he was credited before he became a Bishop :—

There is no power extant which can alter the machinery of nature.

When taxed with this statement he could not recall having made it ; but in case he had done so, he explained both what he could not have meant and what his view on the subject really was :—

To Canon Cook

I certainly did not mean that God could not interfere with the machinery, or that He could not delegate or had not delegated this power to others.

To Canon Cook

A man who doubts if God *can* work miracles seems to me not really to believe in a God at all. I have no doubt at all not only that He can, but that He did. But He did work miracles at the time when miracles were the best mode of teaching ; and now that they are not the best mode of teaching He does not. Miracles were never allowed to be the supreme argument.

But in writing the *Bampton Lectures* he was determined that no misconception as to his meaning should be possible in the future :—

Newton's investigations (he writes) were unquestionably pursued, as all true scientific investigations must ever be pursued, in reliance on the truth of the uniformity of nature, and yet he never felt it the slightest hindrance to his progress that he always tacitly and often expressly acknowledged that God had reserved to Himself the power of setting this uniformity aside, and indeed believed that He had used this power. The believer who asserts the universality of a law,

¹ *Essays and Reviews*, p. 24.

except when God works a miracle to set it aside, is certainly at no real disadvantage in comparison with an unbeliever who makes the same assertion with no qualification at all.¹

In a word, it may be said, that larger responsibilities had changed the relative order of things in Dr. Temple's mind; the last was now first. He still recognised the mischief that might be done to the young by ignoring new knowledge, and by making the Bible a guide to truth which it was not intended to teach; but now he also recognised the claims of old as well as young, and of simple as well as learned; and, while mindful that God's revelation would always show its Divine origin by power to meet new needs, it became increasingly his chief aim not to present Christianity in a new form to the age, but by contending with what was selfish and sensual, and cultivating concern for the weightier and higher things, to make the age more capable of receiving Christianity.

The same tendency was observable as regards ecclesiastical subjects. The gradual change in tone noticed by some of his hearers² when he was speaking about Confirmation and kindred topics, was more traceable to a better understanding of his teaching than to change in the teaching itself; but still it was there. The same may be said about his views as to Convocation and the marriage question; he became more sympathetic with what may be termed the Church line. As the life became larger, the mind became larger also; it saw more fully into the meaning, both of old and new, and found room for what was true in each; above all, he increasingly desired to set the highest in its right place.

His views on politics were also influenced in the same direction by the same considerations. Here

¹ *Bampton Lectures*, pp. 228, 229.

² Mr. John Shelly's Memorandum, "Exeter" Memoir, vol. i. p. 497.

are two letters relating to politics. Each has the note of responsibility in it, the former showing the resolve always characteristic of him, to go to the principles of political measures rather than to their place in the party system; and the latter indicating the final attitude of his mind as to an individual statesman and national policy. Never limited by partizanship in his political creed, he became more absolutely unfettered as the responsibilities of his life multiplied. He rose into higher regions; he thought for the nation as a whole:—

To H. Lee Warner

ST. BURIAN RECTORY, PENZANCE,
March 12, 1873.

. . . Your bugbear, the Irish Bill,¹ is out of the way by this time. I did not approve of all the details. But I should have supported the Bill if I had had the chance.

I do not think a University in which modern history is relegated to the colleges equal to one in which it is taught by University Professors. But I think such a University might, nevertheless, teach modern history with great effect. And half a loaf is better than no bread.

The theory of the opposition to the Bill really is, that we are to back up the Roman Catholic laity in opposition to the Roman Catholic clergy. No mistake can be greater. You cannot *give* people spiritual liberty. They must *win* it for themselves or they cannot have it. The fair University for Ireland is one in which the Irish people can, if they choose, and as long as they choose, and in as great proportion as they choose, put their clergy in charge of it; not one in which they cannot (a purely secular), nor one in which they must, whether they wish it or no (a denominational); and then they might win their own spiritual liberty as we did long ago.

To the Same

FULHAM PALACE, S.W.,
August 16, 1886.

. . . I am a little sorry that you should feel the slightest annoyance with yourself at not having talked about your

¹ Mr. Gladstone's Irish University Bill.

political plans, when last I walked with you from the Athenæum to Gt. George's Street. Your reticence was quite right, and I perfectly understood it. You had made up your mind, and indeed unless you meant to keep out of political action just at present altogether, the time had come when it was a necessity to have made up your mind. To talk with me at such a time would have been a mistake. I could not have helped you. I might have hindered you. In all political life there must come moments when a man not only has a right to say, but is bound to say, "I can consider this question no more, I have done my best with it. It is time for acting on my conclusions; I am no longer at liberty to consider the question open, or to discuss it with any one."

The question put at the elections was not "Home Rule" or "No Home Rule." It was "Gladstone" or "not Gladstone." And on that question I was and am quite clear on the negative side. His Bill demonstrated, in my judgment, that he was not the man to whom the solution of the problem could be entrusted.

It is useless in such a case to say that he would have altered, that he had practically surrendered his Bill. The proposals in it showed that he did not understand the conditions, and to let him handle the business would have been fatal.

His Bill degraded Ireland as a whole, provided no means of settling the inevitable disputes which would have arisen between the Irish and the Imperial Parliament, and provided no protection for Ulster and the rest of the minority. These three fatal objections it is simply ridiculous to treat as matters of detail to be dealt with in Committee. The proposer of such mistakes ought not to be trusted with *that* business any more.

Whatever Home Rule be conceded, it is essential that Ireland should have her full share in the Imperial Legislature. Otherwise, it would become a clear duty, incumbent on the Irish, to work for total separation. They ought not to submit to be a mere dependency with no voice in the councils of the world. They will seek, and they will rightly seek, a Flag of their own, and a Foreign Policy of their own, and a name among the nations of their own.

Now in his secret soul Gladstone would not object to this in the last resort. He has in him nothing of the Imperial instinct. He sees no advantage to humanity in the existence of the British Empire. He would have been glad if the

Civil War in the United States had ended in the separation of the South from the North. It would have seemed to him a juster end. So, too, it would not really shock him to contemplate the loss of Ireland from the British Empire. He does not feel with us when we talk of our Empire as a gift from God, to be used for the good of mankind.

Now England has the Imperial feeling very strongly, and will not part with Ireland or with Scotland or with Wales on any terms whatever. And a Statesman who has not that in him is not the Statesman that England can trust.

But further, whatever Home Rule is conceded must be distinctly defined by Statute, so that any action beyond the defined limits may be set aside by the ordinary Courts of Law. Nothing but this will prevent disputes becoming interminable and intolerable. The powers of Parliament must remain undefined; and the powers of *all* subordinate bodies, be they what they may, from the lowest to the highest, must be defined. And finally, justice must be done to Ulster, and we must not have to coerce Ulster to submit to what Ulster considers an alien power. Gladstone himself feels this, but he knows that Parnell's followers will not consent, and that he could not carry his Bill without their aid, and he therefore leaves it out; in hopes, I believe, that the rest of Parliament will put it in.

A statesman who goes wrong in this hopeless way is of necessity dismissed. And I fear the Liberal Party will long suffer damage from his action. He has not always been true to Liberal principles; I have never considered him true to Liberalism on the religious side. But up to this point his divergence from true Liberalism has always been within comparatively narrow limits; and, as no man is perfect, it has been possible to condone his divergences for the sake of his splendid services. We have come to the point at which such condonation is possible no more. By far the best thing for the country and for the Liberal Party would be his final retirement from public life.

To the same tendency—the influence of larger responsibilities—must be referred his attitude towards education. There was a period in his earlier years when he had looked favourably on a secular system. Dr. Jowett used to say that in discussions on national education amongst the Balliol friends,

he took the religious and Temple the secular side.¹ This is borne out by the following extract from a letter written to his sister Netta when he was at the Education Office :—

April 15, 1856.

. . . I have not made what I want in the way of education quite clear, because I care so much for education that if I can get it I do not care so much what it is. I do not believe the poor trust those above them implicitly in regard to such matters as religious education. If they did there would be no need of the withdrawal clause. I do not believe that to leave the child uneducated is better than to give it merely secular education. I am deeply convinced that the religious education given in schools is so thin, so worthless in comparison with their being educated at all, that though I desire to have it I cannot lay much stress upon it. The education which I care for is that which strengthens the character, not that which teaches. And all my experience tends to this, that the education which strengthens the character is, as our schools are constituted, *not* the religious but the secular. The only true religious education of the great mass must be given at *home*, so that in plain words I do not believe in the distinction between clever and good which you draw; not, that is, in school education.² . . . I am not sure that if I were a clergyman in a living I should not try to set the example of setting up secular schools in my parish. I prefer the other plan, not because I think it better in itself, but because I think the clergy will work it better. But, on the whole, the establishment of secular schools would not diminish the religious teaching one iota. You would have the Friday school instead of the present Sunday school, and you may depend upon it the Friday school would do quite as much as the present week-day school in religious teaching. In a *very* great number of parishes the clergyman would give up the whole of Friday to that work alone, and his regular work so spent would outweigh that of a good many schoolmasters. Again, you are quite mistaken in saying that the upper classes show their religious instinct by always preferring to send their children to schools kept by clergymen. It is not religion but respectability for which they consider the

¹ Memorandum by the Rev. Lewis Campbell, M.A., LL.D.

² Something of this letter is apparently missing.

clerical title to be a guarantee. This is proved by the fact that the upper classes when dissenters have no feeling of the sort about the dissenting ministers. As to striving for the best, I do not think it quite honest to conceal that I do not think the best so very much better than the second best. And there is some reason to fear that in striving for the best we may get the worst. You are mistaken, too, in supposing that any one would be so silly as to require a promise from a schoolmaster not to touch on religious subjects. A secular system would not involve anything of that kind. It would simply be an understood thing that religious teaching was not the schoolmaster's business. He would not be allowed to put a religious lesson on his time-table, but he would make no promise never to speak of such subjects. You find difficulty in following the public movements in matters of this kind because you do not see that good men are on the whole not very far apart in their aims. You are naturally a little of an alarmist, and think that this course and that course lead to tremendous consequences. Depend upon it that is not so. The issues of these matters are in higher hands. A nation takes a wrong step when it falls away from its own deep convictions; not when in a matter where the best men are divided, and not very unequally divided, it chooses one course or another. Secular schools in England would not be irreligious; I am by no means sure that on the whole they and the system connected with them would not be more religious (in the ordinary sense of that word) than the denominational. And denominational schools on the whole will not be very religious; not, to tell the truth, so religious as I should wish them. I *respect* the feeling which makes England shrink from secular schools; but I cannot *reverence* what is so mere a sentiment. The sight of a secular system working by the side of the correlative religious system would dispel the whole feeling in a year. Try to feel a little more calmness, a little more confidence in general good sense, a little more belief that God governs the issues, and you would find it easier to see what we are all doing.

But Rugby and still more his experiences as a Bishop changed his view. It was not that to the very last he would have said that secular education is worse than no education; but when

brought face to face as a Bishop with the clergy and all classes of society he learnt to be more fully sensible of the needs of the latter and of the value of the work done by the former. It is striking to note the effect produced upon him in this connexion from the very first by his experiences in confirming. At those times he was brought face to face with young life ; he saw it individually at a moment when, for good or evil, it speaks out very plainly. As might be imagined, and as those who are able to recall the scenes recollect, he watched intently and was profoundly stirred. His first round of Confirmations in the Exeter Diocese coincided with the introduction of Mr. Forster's Bill in 1870, and in his first educational speeches¹ he brought the two things together, and said that the strongest impression made upon him as he had looked at the dull and puzzled faces of many of the candidates was the need of a higher standard of education to enable them to apprehend religious teaching. He desired the spiritual and intellectual to go hand in hand. It was not that he was thinking about making good young churchmen—that thought was hardly “in it,” it was swallowed up in something larger, which became larger and larger every year to the end of his life, the more he saw of all classes and ages. “It is not knowledge chiefly but character that England wants ;” this was still increasingly his plea ; but he sees more clearly than in earlier days that the formation of character is bound up with the religious ordering of national education. It is not too much to say that, much as he had done for religious education before, his absolute devotion to it dates from the time of his becoming a bishop. And through and in this work he learnt better to know the clergy. He had not really learnt to know them at the Education

¹ See “Exeter” Memoir, vol. i. pp. 343, 344.

Office; they do not show their best side to the educational official. It is not when foraging for supplies and extracting grants of public money for their schools that they do most to commend themselves, and they will not go for a good character in the direction of Whitehall. But the Bishop learnt to know them in a different way from the inspector. The following letters show what he was for their schools, and how his care for the schools first gave them insight into his care for all their work, and drew their hearts together. The letters fit in with the final scene in the House of Lords and his last effort in the cause which he greatly served. The interview to which they allude was indeed a kind of prelude to it; it took place on the same day:—

To Archdeacon Sandford

BISHOPSCOURT, AUCKLAND,
July 1, 1904.

MY DEAR SIR—Great pressure of work has hindered me from earlier carrying out my intention of forwarding you the enclosed. Were it not for the hurry of catching the mail, I could search out another letter from “the great Archbishop” anent my accepting this Sec. But I quite recollect its purport: “You have to go, and I greatly sympathise with you. Come over to Lambeth and see me.” I went to luncheon there the very day he collapsed in the House of Lords. I left him to have a rest in the drawing-room before going to the House; I can hear him now saying his last words to me:—“Well, good-bye; God bless you. You must go. I want to consecrate you myself; but I don’t think they (N.Z. Canons) will let me; but I’ll try. When the December mail comes in, bring the letters down to Canterbury, stay with us there, and we’ll talk it over again.” I went to Canterbury: it was to his funeral. In the summer of 1902 he preached in my London church for the schools. One of my young men took down the sermon, and I gave it to Mrs. Temple. It was just like a bit of S. John’s Epistles. I shall never forget its tenderness. In the vestry afterwards, he tenderly blessed my school Headmaster. When I went to S. Stephen’s, Paddington, the schools were shocking and were rightly condemned.

The Bishop (then) got my letter, about a meeting to try to save the position, on May 17. The *next* day (Sunday) he wrote the enclosed. I always say we built schools costing £11,000 on the foundation of his letter. Please return it. I treasure it.

FULHAM PALACE, May 18, 1895.

MY DEAR MR. NELIGAN—I hope your parishioners will come to a right decision concerning your Schools on Friday next. It is of the very gravest importance to maintain all the Church Schools we have got, not only for the sake of the parishes in which the schools stand, but for the sake of the whole Church and Country. Religious education can be maintained in this day, as in former days, by one thing and one thing only, and that is the self-sacrifice of religious people. We cannot uphold a strong public opinion in favour of religious instruction unless we are ready to pay largely for upholding it. And if religious people do not care enough for it to do that, other people will assuredly be ready enough to let the whole thing go; Board Schools do not give the best, but they do give some religious instruction; but they will not long continue to do so if the Schools which make that the first consideration are all given up. For the sake of our Country's future make every effort to maintain our Church Schools.—Yours faithfully,

F. LONDON :

I think I was one of the youngest Incumbents in London then. There were big difficulties in the parish; on two or three occasions I had to telegraph to the Bishop for interviews on the difficulties, besides many letters. He always saw me, went into the points, and then used to tell me what to do thus: "You can go back and say, *the Bishop of London* told you to do" so and so. Once I remember saying, "What am I to do in this matter, my lord?" and he replied, "You're to *do nothing*, and, if any one asks you why you don't take action, say the Bishop of London told you to do nothing." I could cover pages with stories of his goodness to me and mine; his solid backing-up of a young incumbent in difficult places; his tenderness always; but time for closing is at hand. I have the reproduction of Herkomer's picture of him in my study here, and love to look at it. I can recollect him as his eyes filled with tears at Lambeth when I said to him, "If I can ever be to my Clergy in N.Z. what you have been to me, it will be because of your dealing with me and teaching." He just said gently, "God bless you."—Yours faithfully,

M. R. AUCKLAND.

Bishop Temple gave proof that the responsibilities of a new office had deepened his interest in the religious side of secondary no less than elementary education. In this case also he used to refer to Confirmation experiences. When he came to Exeter in 1894 to inaugurate an association for promoting religious education in secondary schools, he based his remarks largely on information given him by the clergy, that in preparing their candidates they often found that the children of the middle and upper classes had not been as carefully and fully taught as the children of the poor.¹ At a later date he became Chairman of the Joint Committee appointed by Convocation in 1896 for the consideration of the subject of secondary education in its religious connexion; and eventually, when Archbishop, he accepted the post of President of the Church Central Council of Secondary Education established as the outcome of that Committee. The Council was intended to be the accredited organ of the Church in dealing with this subject, and as such was brought into connexion, by representation, with the Universities and Public Schools as well as the several Dioceses. The inaugural meeting was held in the Church House, Westminster, on January 18, 1899, under the presidency of Archbishop Temple. The Archbishop of York was also present, and a large number of Bishops and members of both Convocations and the Lay Houses, together with others interested in education. The Archbishop wrote a special pastoral letter recommending the establishment of Diocesan Associations in affiliation with the Council, for the purpose of furthering the work locally. His desire was to enlist the sympathy of teachers and parents, and to permeate the Church with something of the same interest in the religious side of secondary

¹ "Exeter" Memoir, vol. i. p. 604.

education as had worked powerfully in primary schools. He was a constant attendant at the meetings of the Council and its committees, and the day on which he presided for the last time (July 11, 1902) as President of a joint session of the two Convocations with the Lay Houses was closed by his attendance, with the Archbishop of York, at a united meeting of the Secondary Education Councils of the two provinces.

But the interest in education was as comprehensive as ever; he was as staunch a supporter as in the old days of the whole cause—the secular no less than the religious side—the counsel as sage and the tone as healthy and liberal. While Bishop of London he was Chairman of the Standing Committee of the National Society; he was special adviser of Archbishop Benson in all educational matters, and presided over the committee appointed by him, 1893-94, to make proposals satisfactory to voluntary schools for the settlement of the education question. The report of this committee, of which the main suggestion was that the State should undertake the payment of the teachers in elementary schools, was written by himself. But he gave his aid to the authorities of the State as well as to those of the Church. Thus, as noted in a previous section of this work,¹ he gave evidence before the Commissions² appointed, 1889-1894, for the creation of a teaching University for London, and he was a member of the Royal Commission of Elementary Education appointed in 1888.³ He was obliged to decline a seat on the Royal Commission on Secondary Education appointed in 1894, but he was one of the witnesses examined.³ The following letter, for which the Editor is indebted to the Right Hon. James Bryce, Chairman of the

¹ "London" Memoir, pp. 73-80.

² *Ibid.* p. 80.

³ "Exeter" Memoir, vol. i. p. 329.

Commission, is a useful supplement to Mr. Roby's account of Dr. Temple's services on the previous Commission of 1865, and carries on the record of his former connexion with the national side of secondary education to its close:—

54 PORTLAND PLACE, W.,
July 10, 1905.

MY DEAR SANDFORD—The progress made in the work of reorganising and developing Secondary Education in England—a work still far from completed—dates its beginning from the appointment of the Schools Inquiry Commission of 1865-68.

Of that Commission Dr. Temple, then Headmaster of Rugby, was the life and soul. He supplied the leading ideas which guided it, and I believe that he wrote the larger part of the Report, a report which still stands out among documents of that kind as singularly clear, cogent and vigorous, admirable in style as well as in arrangement. I had the honour of being one of the Assistant Commissioners who conducted the inquiry in various parts of the country, and we all looked to him as the Commissioner who best understood the subject and most closely followed the facts we collected. He used to read our reports with great care, and I recal an instance in which, thinking that a statement I had made regarding the so-called Conscience Clause might be misconstrued, he wrote me a long letter suggesting a modification in what I had said, the propriety of which I saw at once. Many years later, in 1894, I was chairman of another Royal Commission appointed to carry on the work and deal with branches of it which the legislation of 1869 and subsequent sessions had left untouched. This "Secondary Education Commission" hesitated to ask him to help us by coming to give evidence, for we knew how pressed he was by his duties as Bishop of London. However we did ask him. He responded at once in the promptest way, and gave us evidence which occupied a whole sitting and which we found most valuable. Many years had passed since he had been directly concerned with most of the matters on which we questioned him. But he spoke as if he had been constantly occupied with them. He seemed to carry the Report of 1868 in his head, and discussed the points it had raised with as much ease and freshness of knowledge as if he had been thinking of nothing else during the twenty-six years that had elapsed. Upon such topics as the proper

mode of constituting local educational authorities, upon the provision of Exhibitions, upon the relations of Elementary and Secondary education, and of the so-called Higher Grade Elementary Schools to the cheapest class of Secondary Schools (the third grade schools of the report of 1868), he was perfectly at home. We put to him, among other things, the question of undenominational religious education and religious teaching generally in Secondary Schools, and that of clerical restrictions on headmasterships. On both points he spoke with perfect frankness, expressing his own views (eminently liberal views) without any thought of how those views might be regarded by any section of opinion, political or ecclesiastical. He left us full of admiration for the clearness and force of his mind, and its faculty of grappling quickly with any point placed before it. Indeed, he did not seem to me to have lost any of the vigour, or any of the interest in education, which he had shown in the days when he was Headmaster of Rugby, leading the educational reformers of a generation from which few but he had survived. —Believe me, yours very sincerely, JAMES BRYCE.

The following letter, written in 1883, will also be found useful as illustrating the line which Dr. Temple's mind followed as to the development of educational system. It is a shrewd forecast of future settlements:—

PORT ELIOT, ST. GERMAN'S, CORNWALL,
September 22, 1883.

MY DEAR ACLAND¹—I return Thompson's letters and the other papers.

His idea is, I think, not at all a bad one, but I fear somewhat difficult to work.

Will the Schools accept the proposed inspection?

The public in general know so little what a School can do and cannot do that even a first-rate School would have some reason to fear the result of a perfectly just and full report. A first-rate School is inspected and gets a just report; in competition with it a thoroughly bad School refuses inspection. The public will assuredly believe that the bad School is the better of the two. They will refuse to believe that a School can be a really good School which does so little as the report

¹ The present Sir C. T. D. Acland, Bart., son of the Archbishop's old friend.

shows the good School to do. The inspector may of course report not facts but opinions; but, if so, he will be fiercely assailed by those whose work he condemns, and without going into details of fact will find it hard to defend himself.

This difficulty is a serious one. I do not deny that a judicious inspector may overcome it in course of time. He may make it his aim not so much to test the Schools and drive the bad ones out of existence, as to advise the Schools and gradually to bring all to a higher level. A good many will then welcome his visits.

But in the next place who will pay for this inspection? The Schools ought to pay. But they will be very unwilling to do so. It is difficult to get Parents to pay what is needed for teaching, and will be very difficult to get them to pay what more is needed for examining. Examining is a kind, and a valuable, I may say an essential kind, of teaching; and the money paid for it is well spent, quite as well spent as the money spent for teaching, if not better. But it is not easy to get the parents to see this. To ask schoolmasters to pay out of their own pockets, is to ask much; and to ask parents to add examination fees to the present tuition fees is to ask very much. The expense is a real difficulty. The School examination system of the Universities finds the expense an obstacle to its acceptance in the highest grade of Schools; how much more in the lower.

These two difficulties were the reasons why your Father and I, when we applied to the Universities twenty-six years ago to begin the Local Examinations, were compelled to propose an examination of Scholars and not an examination of Schools. We knew we should get a sufficient number of scholars to our proposed examinations; we feared, and I think rightly feared, we should not get a sufficient number of Schools.

But we did nevertheless look forward to the day coming when we could have Schools, and not Scholars only, examined. Perhaps it has come. At any rate any who are willing to try should be encouraged.

One thing would encourage it much. Do not try to pay for the examination, nor for the inspection. The Schools ought to pay for it, and can. But offer a few Exhibitions yearly for competition to those Schools and to those only that admitted the Inspectors. Let the County, by a well-chosen Committee, appoint the Inspectors, and let them subscribe to keep going a fair number of Exhibitions. I think this plan might work.

With regard to the Endowed Schools, I do not think they can do what Thompson believes. They are too unevenly distributed. But they could do more than they are doing. But they will not do real good except under strong local control of such a character as to be above petty jobs and petty interests. A County Board might handle them well; but while you have nothing between a set of Trustees for a little town, and a Central Office in London, we have little chance of doing much.

Perhaps when County Boards are established for County business generally, each County Board might be empowered to appoint an Educational Committee for the County. Such a Committee would have real power, and might do much.—
Yours ever, F. EXON.

Dr. Temple's educational views were modified and changed by larger responsibilities; but the expression of them was essentially true to the principle from which he started. He had no belief in an attempt to string up every one to the same pitch of intellectual attainment—individual powers differed, and it was a mistake “to educate any one beyond his brains”; but he desired that good mental training should be offered to all, and that *special* opportunities should be within the reach of those who could profit by them. His own personal experience made him a firm believer in the good which came through the discharge of parental responsibility, and he had no wish that the State should relieve parents of their obligations in this respect (he accepted, but he never loved, the principle of free education); but he believed that the State should give aid to parents as far as it was needed; and he held it to be a special prerogative of the English Church, with the tradition and spirit of the Reformation behind and in her, to co-operate with the State in this matter and thus to afford to each individual the power of rightly governing his own life.

In carrying out this work the special charge of

the Church was the *religious* training, and in fulfilling it he desired that the Church should recognise to the full the natural relationship of the parent. At one period of his life he had been more or less favourable to the comprehensive system of religious instruction which teaches religion but avoids controverted points;¹ but as time went on he was drawn increasingly to the conviction that different religious bodies, as representing the parents, must have opportunities to provide religious instruction in accordance with their own tenets. This was no retrograde mental step, but the conclusion of a larger liberalism, well expressed in the words which he used in regard to the proposed charter for Gresham University :—

The inclusion of denominational colleges in an undenominational University appears to me to be the true development of Liberal principles in application to education. The true advancement of Liberal principles is not to exclude from national purview the most important of all possible subjects, but to reconcile the inclusion of such subjects with strict justice to all.²

These words were written with reference to arrangements for University education, but the principle applies to all branches of education equally. Dr. Temple knew that the methods of applying them would vary from time to time, and for this reason he never expected legislative measures to look very far ahead; he was ready to take them, if fairly satisfactory, for the time, and to make the best of them; but principles were permanent, and for these, as he had worked them out in the experience of life, he was prepared unswervingly to contend.

Responsibility deepened and enlarged Dr.

¹ See letter to Mr. Coleridge, July 14, 1849, p. 563.

² Letter of Bishop of London to C. S. Roundell, Esq. See Appendix B of the "London" Memoir, p. 203.

Temple's thought and character, but it did not make him over anxious or bring any restlessness into his life. He became, indeed, more silent than he had been in the old times, partly because silence was restful and partly because it was safe. "I am so fully surrounded with confidences on all sides that I can hardly speak at all on the bigger subjects in ordinary conversation," he said when Archbishop to a friend who asked him a question about some matter of public interest. Except on rare occasions, when his heart was opened to a few close friends who had gathered round him, his talk in later years was on lighter subjects—the things which cheer life, not those which fill it; it was harder to evoke that interchange of mind which made Jowett delight in Temple's conversation "more than in that of any other man;"¹ but he was never manifestly on the stretch of anxiety: "do your best and then have done with it. That is my advice, and now don't think any more about it; it will be bad for you if you do." So he preached and so he lived. This restfulness and freedom from distraction were due in measure to the fact that his sense of responsibility was not so much a concern for the management of current topics and incidents of the moment as for deeper and far-reaching issues. He dealt with the former, but they never engrossed him; he lived in the greater and graver things. Partly it came because he had lived his life and reached his final conclusions. He was stablished and settled and fully persuaded in his own mind; he had now but to wait for the more perfect knowledge that was beyond. For the rest, the secret of his quietness and immobility comes out in the following letter from an incumbent in the Canterbury Diocese:—

¹ *Life of Benjamin Jowett*, vol. i. p. 195.

*To Archdeacon Sandford**May 7, 1904.*

SIR—I venture to give you this reminiscence of Archbishop Temple. I thought it characteristic. More than that—the remembrance has always been a great comfort.

He was (as my Archbishop) spending the day here, and preaching for me. After lunch we went into my study, and he let me talk to him. He was so exceedingly fatherly that day, that I was led on to talk to him about the great problems and mysteries of life, and told him of a certain matter which weighed upon me at times with an almost insupportable weight. It was connected with the hereafter. I may as well say it was the notion of *endlessness* of time. He listened patiently, and suggested certain lines of thought—and asked if I did not think Hegel's philosophy helped over such a matter.

Then I said, bluntly enough—"My Lord, have *you* never had any of these troubles? Don't *you* ever feel the mystery of that other life?"

He turned in his chair, put his hand up to his chin, looked at me a moment in his steady way, and then said—"Yes, I think I know what you mean. But I believe so entirely that God is my Father, and that He loves me, and that He will make me perfectly happy in the other life, that I never worry myself over what that life will be."

I remember thinking—here is one of the biggest men in England living in the same simple faith that supports the humblest Christian washerwoman—belief in God's Love. The answer did more to help me than anything else he said—and it may be a comfort to others.

I was always intensely struck by his *reverence* in prayer. Temple on his knees was a lesson to me for life.

CHAPTER V

THE COMPLETED LIFE

The care of the Faith, the Church, National life—Matured character, his chief offering to the Church and Nation—Home life in old age, correspondence with his son—Humour and pregnant sayings—Deepening sympathy—Daily service in Canterbury Cathedral—*Nunc Dimittis*.

THE call to London, and still more to Canterbury, came to one whose convictions and character were already fully formed. In mature and later years Dr. Temple learnt more from the lives of men than from their thoughts. Always a disciple of good men, always studying great collective movements, he yet was not quick in old age to take in new ideas from individual minds: in this sense he had “seen an end of all perfection.” For this characteristic the intensity of his study in earlier life is largely responsible. A great deal had been taken out of a man who could write:—

Reading Coleridge excites me so much that I can hardly do anything else after it; I am obliged never to read it except just before I am going to walk.¹

The same thing is implied still more plainly in what he says about mathematics:—

Mathematics take it out of one, as the saying is, and still

¹ To his sister Katy, May 26, 1841.

more so with me, because I am so fond of it that while I am on this branch of study I can hardly think of anything else.¹

And while a good deal was taken out, a good deal was also put in; the subjects and the authors studied so intently became part of him, and as the result he did not readily turn to the thoughts of new men—they did not seem to him to be new, and in a sense they were not; he had already assimilated much of what they said and passed a judgment upon it. He writes thus to a former pupil:—²

RUGBY, 1865.

I have dipped into the great Poet, and have recognised how much older I am than I thought.

Altogether Browning is still very much of a phenomenon to me. I get vexed with his obscurity, which often seems insulting to his readers. He keeps up a dialogue with himself very often in which it is hard to separate the interlocutors, and it is difficult for me to believe that any one will take the trouble to do so. For nothing is more provoking than to be needlessly puzzled. Then I must add that the thoughts are rarely new to me. Except in "Caliban" (which, after all, is not the highest of all subjects), I do not think I have come across a truly original thought yet. There is no doubt very often a fine bit of description, as for instance in "Saul." And there is always an honest grappling with the problems of the day. But the problems are not solved; they are only stated. And that work I have done for myself long ago.

To me the chief interest of the book remains what it was, namely, that it interests you and others like you. I *know* that there must be real power in it for this reason. But it has not yet laid hold of me.

He was conscious of the danger of mental sterility resulting from over-much work, as a letter to another old pupil testifies:—³

¹ To his Mother, May 18, 1842.

² E. M. Oakeley.

³ H. Lee Warner.

August 16, 1886.

I suppose by this time you are settled down at Swaffham, and beginning to enjoy the "more time" for which you have left Rugby. How well I can understand your feelings ! In these hard-working occupations (such as that of teaching must always be) there is a frequent sense that the worker is sacrificed to the work, that you deteriorate because you do your work to the very best of your power, that if you went on long not the worker only, but the work too would be the worse. It is true. But there is another truth too that goes along with it ; and that is that when we get the "more time" we do not always find that we can use it. We go on working ; we cannot stop to think ; and we feel that we are drying up for want of fresh thought. But when we stop, we do not always find that the fresh thought comes. And without fresh thought the larger experience, and even the better ordering of the experience, which leisure gives, seems to furnish our minds with more of what we had before, but not with anything of a higher quality ; and it is quality and not quantity of mental furniture that we want in middle life. To mix more with different classes of men, to read with a view to understand them, and sometimes to let the mind lie fallow for a while that we may let true conclusions come to us instead of our seeking them (always a dangerous, often a delusive search), seems to me the only remedy for the sterility that comes of too continuous work. Provided always that the first thing in us be the spiritual life, communion with God, and frequent dwelling on the noblest and best that we can find in what has come from Him. •

The charge of an "arid mind"¹ cannot with justice be made against him even in later years. He had a wonderful power of putting freshness into what was most familiar to him, and the last words just quoted reveal the secret of the inspiration. But though the spirit was fresh when he came to London and Canterbury the methods were not new. The gain which had been secured by having him there was that in a time of great restlessness there was at the head a man who had lived in the greater things, whose mind was larger and will more resolute than

¹ See "Exeter" Memoir, vol. i. p. 406.

those of others, one who saw more clearly and went deeper than any one else. Responsibility was 'the breath of his nostrils,'¹ and sat more easily on him than on other men; but yet for the greater things his sense of it always weighed heavily. It may be summed up as threefold—for the Faith, the Church, and National Life.

1. It was his deep sense of responsibility for the Faith which prompted his earnestness both in accepting new light and also in safeguarding essential truth. The supreme expression of the sense of this responsibility was his ever-deepening interest in maintaining the union of religion with education. This prompted both his earnest contention that the teaching of religion should form an essential part of National education, and also that its integrity should be preserved in Church schools. "You may depend upon it, that if the religious instruction begins to be in any degree tampered with in our Church schools, the Church schools will disappear with a suddenness that will astonish the Church," he said at the Exeter Church Congress (1894). This was the reason for the insistence with which he urged self-sacrifice on the part of Churchmen in the support of their schools, and it explains the extreme unwillingness with which he gave in to the demand of Churchmen for a share in the rates. "The slippery slope," he called it, "of support from the rates." It was not that he objected on principle to the application of rate aid to the support of Church schools; he advocated the employment of rate aid in his Oxford Essay in 1856;² he had approved of the proposal in Mr. Forster's Bill in 1870, which, as first drafted, permitted it. But, with growing experience, he became increasingly convinced of the difficulties of securing religious

¹ See "Primacy" Memoir, p. 247.

² See "Education Office" Memoir, vol. i. p. 122.

instruction effectively in any rate-supported system, and he shrank from the risk involved in the application as long as possible. Not until he had unavailingly proposed a plan¹ for meeting the financial difficulty by throwing the payment of the teachers on the State, and saw that further resistance was hopeless, did he consent to fall in with the experiment.² But having once accepted the principle he stood to it stoutly,³ although as late as July 1901 his personal objection was still strong: "For myself," he said in Convocation, ("I very much object to have support (for Church schools) from the rates." To the same 'cause—his anxiety for the religious training of the children as a security for the Faith—is to be set his constant reiteration of the duty of the clergy to continue to teach in their schools, and above all, his constant insistence that religious teaching should only be entrusted to those who had given some security for their religious belief. 'He believed that Churchmen would be willing to hand over the control of the secular curriculum to the Local Authority, provided they could themselves retain the control of the religious teaching together with the appointment of the teachers.'⁴ He became increasingly sensitive as to the persons who should be

¹ *Supra*, p. 648.

² He formally accepted the principle in 1896 when presiding over a special Committee of the National Society appointed to consider the educational position. The main proposal of the Committee was the application of rate aid to Church schools in School Board districts. This proposal was afterwards submitted by Dr. Temple as Archbishop-Nominate to the Convocations sitting in Committee in Joint-Session with the Lay Houses, and was accepted.

³ The Archbishop was aware in the autumn of 1901 that in the next Education Bill the Government might be prepared to make some proposal to enable the Local Authorities to aid Voluntary Schools out of the Rates, and he took counsel with the Church Central Council of Secondary Education on the subject; he was unaware of the precise form in which the proposal of the Government would be made. See also "Primacy" Memoir, p. 379.

⁴ Speech to Church Central Council of Secondary Education, Oct. 25, 1901.

connected with the Religious Instruction, going so far as to express unwillingness that Government Inspectors should include religious knowledge in the subject of their inspection, even when schools were willing that they should inquire into it.

To Archdeacon Sandford

OLD PALACE, CANTERBURY,
January 4, 1901.

I have thought a good deal about the question of encouraging the Government to put religious as well as all other subjects taught in secondary schools under Government Inspection. On the whole, I do not think it would be safe.

The Inspectors in former days did examine in this subject as well as in others; and they did it very well. But it was under special safeguards. No Inspector could be appointed for Church schools without the consent of the Archbishop of Canterbury. And this was not a mere formality. And in the same spirit the Inspectors of Church schools were all clergymen: the Department might appoint laymen, but never did so.

We should not get such safeguards now. The Lord President of those days chafed against the necessity for getting the Archbishop's consent. And in these days the feeling would be even stronger.

Without safeguards it would be very dangerous to let our schools be led to look to the Inspector in this matter. Now and then a Unitarian would be appointed. And such a man might do very serious mischief by a few scornful expressions.

I do not think it would be wise to risk it.

Again, in reply to a further letter on the subject, he writes:—

To the Same

LAMBETH PALACE,
January 18, 1901.

. . . I still see much risk, and I would rather bid the Government keep its hands off. I am not sure that the Non-conformists would not agree with me.

I wish the Committee would take some pains to ascertain how those who are not Churchmen feel about this matter.

But in spite of difficulties he clung to the principle that, in the interests of the future of Christianity and the religious life of England, religious knowledge should be an integral part of the national system of education.

2. The sense of responsibility for the Church and State alike made him a strong opponent of disestablishment. The strength of his conviction is pithily expressed in a letter to one of his friends:—*"I think it (Disestablishment) will be a step down for the whole nation."*¹ Hence he threw himself whole-heartedly into the cause of Church Defence, and was exceedingly anxious that it should be organised on the right lines. But it was not Disestablishment which was his chief fear. The earnestness of feeling displayed in his reply to the Deputation of Church Laymen on the subject of "the opinion of the two Archbishops" will not be soon forgotten, and was due to a deeper cause:—

I am quite ready to face Disestablishment and its necessary concomitant, Disendowment, if it be God's will. I am quite prepared in that case still to go on and act as if we stood in the same position as that which we have held for the last 300 years. But (here the voice broke with deep emotion) I dread, with all my soul I dread, what may come, if the Church of England were to break in two.²

The fear of disruption, resulting from the action of the extreme Ritualistic party, prompted these words. It was the same fear of disruption which led him steadily to resist all hasty measures for the suppression of Ritualism.³ He was convinced that in the long-run disintegration would be most surely averted by the steadier policy. There were two sheet-anchors of his policy; one was his continuous effort throughout his episcopacy to maintain and raise the

¹ Letter to F. Palgrave, October 2, 1885.

² See "Primacy" Memoir, p. 304.

³ See "London" Memoir, pp. 101-117.

level of clerical life and attainment ; the other, his intense desire to secure for the laity their full rights as members of the Church. His sense of responsibility on the latter subject was strikingly shown in communications with Archbishop Benson previous to the delivery of the Lambeth judgment in November 1890. It is well known that it was Bishop Temple's practice to adopt the North-end position in the celebration of the Holy Communion. He believed that that position was the only one which satisfied the intention of the Rubric after the removal of the Holy Table to the East end of the Church had been brought about by Archbishop Laud, and that it was a recognition of the position of laymen in relation to the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. His conviction was strong, and was strongly expressed in the memorandum which he laid before Archbishop Benson :—

The purpose (of the change made in 1552) was to make the Communion more of a Feast, less of a Sacrifice. . . . The whole service was to be much more the act of the Congregation, with the Priest as one of them to be spokesman, much less the act of the Priest on the people's behalf. A good deal was given up when Table and Priest were removed to the East end, but by no means all. The position of the Priest with his side to them still kept something of what was expressed in the "North-side" Rubric. . . .

But Bishop Temple concedes that it is impossible to carry the binding force of the "North-side" Rubric beyond the first four prayers (the Lord's Prayer, the Communion Collect, the Collect for the day, and the Prayer for the Sovereign) :—

. . . The positive direction to stand at the North side of the Table applies to the first four Prayers above, and cannot be carried further. And if those who drew the Rubric in 1552, or those who re-enacted it in 1662, meant it to be carried further, they have not expressed their intention, nor can we now enforce it.

Nor would it be inappropriate that a change of position should be made at this point of the service [viz. immediately before the saying of the prayer for the Church Militant.—ED.] if any Minister when officiating thought fit from this point onwards to make it. For it is here that a characteristic feature of the service is (here) first introduced. Here we offer to God the alms and other devotions of the people. Here we offer the Bread and Wine which are presently to be consecrated. Here, in fact, begins that offering which runs through the service and culminates at last in the offering of our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, and in the offering of ourselves, our souls and bodies, to be a reasonable, holy, and lively sacrifice to God. . . .

. . . This latter Rubric [the Rubric before the prayer of Consecration.—ED.] is ambiguous. With the tables as they now stand it is difficult to reconcile “before the Table” in the first part of the Rubric with “before the people” in the last part. And accordingly it was “quæried” how *this* Rubric should be obeyed.

It follows that, in all probability, we may say, with tolerable certainty, men did stand before the Table during that prayer, knelt there when themselves receiving, and possibly continued there for the rest of the service. . . .

But in spite of these concessions Dr. Temple still contended earnestly for the retention of the North-end position at the beginning of the service, as the expression of a principle.

After a long historical review of the matter he thus concludes:—

The North-end position keeps in a very real sense and degree the spirit of the North-side Rubric; it is the only position which conforms to the Letter of that Rubric; it follows the interpretation put upon that Rubric by those who first moved the Tables to the East end; it was accepted by the great body of the Church, both Clergy and Laity, from 1662 onwards; it still corresponds to the feelings of a vast proportion of the laity; if at various times, here and there, there have been instances of a different use, those instances have never till quite lately received the sanction of any competent authority; and no authority short of Convocation and Parliament ought to sanction its disuse.

In these cases the controversy is between the Clergyman and the Layman. The Church of England has done her very utmost to encourage the Layman to think for himself. The worship is in his own language; the Bible is in his hands; more of the Bible is read to him in Church than is read in the worship of any other Christian Body; the Clergy incessantly preach from it and explain it; the Clergy are foremost in teaching the young to use it. A man so treated inevitably forms opinions and tastes and feelings of his own. But meanwhile the Church of England has preserved the mediæval autocracy of the Clergyman in the worship, and this autocracy stronger than of old because the power of the Bishops over the clergy is distinctly less. And so the Clergyman can mould the services to his liking; may and frequently does indulge his own tastes, feelings, and opinions without any regard to the Layman whatever. The position of the Layman is certainly hard, and indeed if it were not for the regulations of the Church would be intolerable. The regulations of the Church, and in the worship these regulations take the form of Rubrics, check in some degree the Clergyman's autocracy. The Layman has no voice, but he is protected by the Rubrics. Every release of the Clergyman from the Rubrics is a diminution of the protection of the Layman. Liberty to the one very often means oppression on the other. A Court of Bishops is especially bound to be guarded on this point. They above all other men are called on to be fair between the Clergyman and the Layman. And to be indifferent to the religious feelings of the latter is a serious discredit to the Court and lowers its authority.

In this case there seems to me no reason for giving the Clergyman a liberty which there is no evidence that he ever was intended either by Convocation or by Parliament to have.

F. LONDON :

Towards the close of his last letter to Archbishop Benson on the subject (November 8, 1890) are these characteristic words :—

I believe it to be my duty to hold my tongue. I cannot do everything; but I can certainly do that, and I will. But with what pain I cannot express.

The following quotations indicate the lines on

which he proposed to act with regard to the representation of the laity and kindred subjects :—¹

To H. Lee Warner

FULHAM PALACE, *January 28, 1886.*

. . . Next comes a matter of great difficulty, the provision of some sort of Legislative Council, subject to Parliamentary control, but capable of making Church laws with certain checks and within certain limits. We shall have much trouble in getting this. Diocesan Councils and Parochial Councils ought to follow this and be made by it, not precede it. I need not say that here the Laity ought to come in.

A few days later he was making a more formal pronouncement on the subject in Convocation :—

He earnestly desired to impress upon their lordships—as he had pressed on the Diocese of Exeter over and over again—that in some way or other a National Council should be formed which should represent the Church of England as a whole in this island. He hoped that an attempt would be made in that way to develop their present constitution. Why was it that the Convocations of the two Provinces had so little intercourse with one another? How was it possible for the one to represent the whole Church when it only represented part? Why was it that this had gone on so long, people forgetting that under the present system the Provinces of Canterbury and York were as distinct as the Church of England of this country and the Episcopal Church of the United States? They wanted some more real union. He hoped it would be possible to see very speedily the two Convocations united and working together. At any rate, in that or in some other way, there ought to be created a National Council, in which there should be a full representation of the Clergy of both Provinces, and having by the side of it a body of laymen that could be consulted on everything that would be likely to come before parochial councils. It was to such a body as he proposed that all difficult and delicate questions should be referred. It was impossible to predict what was coming upon the Church. They would

¹ "Exeter" Memoir, vol. i. pp. 356, 357.

undoubtedly have formidable questions to encounter before long. He did not see any symptom that the Church was likely to be removed from its position in the nation. He did not think that such a thing was within the range of practical politics, or would be witnessed in the lifetime of any one present; but whatever might be in store they ought to take the opportunity meanwhile of making such reforms in the Church as might be thought wise. Whether beaten in the encounter or not, whether they remained the Church of the nation, or only a branch of Christ's Church settled in the island, they ought to do what they had the power to do for making the Church's work more efficient.¹

But he was fully conscious of the difficulties in the path, and states them in his own straightforward way:—

To H. Lee Warner (continued)

After this will come the regulations of our relations with the Nonconformists, and this will be by far the hardest task and will take some years.

I am quite clear that it is out of the question to include within the Church as such men like Martineau or others who would exclude the mysterious from religious doctrine. To admit Unitarianism within the Church would certainly explode it and make it useless. And it would exclude more Nonconformists than it would take in. The Methodists, for instance, would not work in such a Church.

The Unitarians in fact present the greatest difficulties of all. They are by far the ablest of the Nonconformist bodies, but they are cold and intellectual, they are not fervent and spiritual; and they have always utterly failed to touch the masses. . . .

My present aim after dealing with admitted abuses is a National Church Council with the Laity included in it.

In forming this Council the basis must be in some form religious and not secular. The ratepayers cannot, as such, be the electors; this would make the Council a State Body, not a Church Body. It would make the National Church National first and Church afterwards, and this would destroy it.

¹ The formation of the two Houses of Laymen on their existing basis was carried through in the same year, 1886.

As things now stand the Church of England holds its position on the ground of its historical connexion with the Church of the Apostles. Every Nonconformist Body stands on the ground of a present call from God. Either ground is tenable in the logic of spiritual life. Either ground claims to be heavenly, not earthly. But a Church which was only a branch of the Civil Service would be distinctly of this world and could not live.

To the Same

FULHAM PALACE, March 5, 1888.

I have no doubt in the Temperance work the stiffness of the Church party plagues you and many others. But I have worked earnestly with Nonconformists, and I find them very hard to work with. So very often they will not consent to leave controversy on religious questions outside the door. They like to have a clergyman to work with them; but so very often when he does it they insist that this shall mean that he thinks that their ministry is on a level with his own. And he does not think so and resents being supposed to think so, and with his views this is inevitable. In all these matters we have to bear with human nature as it is, and work hard in the best way we can.¹

From another quarter came difficulties hardly less formidable; they were connected with the special relations in which the National Church stood to the Legislature and the Nation as a whole. These made him anxious as to the form of constitution to be proposed for the lay side of the projected National Church Council, which was the sequel to the institution of the Provincial Lay Houses. The following words, addressed to a deputation which waited on the two Primates at Lambeth Palace, on February 13, 1901, give almost his latest utterances on the subject, and had reference to a

¹ In the same spirit was conceived a remark which he once made to a friend after a conversation with Professor Jowett, who had been advocating the admission of Nonconformist ministers into the pulpits of the Church: "He has no idea of the futility of going into battle if you know that your troops won't follow."

Bill promoted by the Church Reform League, which entrusted to Convocation the construction of the Scheme for the representation of the Laity :—

Whilst I think it right to ask for the formation of Houses of Laymen, . . . I doubt very much whether Parliament would quite consent to pass a Bill in which the formation of the House of Laymen was left so entirely to clerical hands, and I think it would be almost certain that if they passed a measure drawn up like this they would insert some proviso for very definitely indicating what they considered to be the proper definition of a lay constituent of the Church of England. . . . The laity, if they are to be represented, must be represented by those whom they choose. And this body is practically to take the place which Parliament now occupies. Well, Parliament will say, "If they are practically to take our place we must see to it that they do fairly represent those whom they profess to represent." I think it necessary to speak out upon this point, because it is useless for us to go forward if we are going to stand to a matter of this kind in spite of all the resistance that may be offered to us. I will not deny that for myself I should prefer a House of Laymen that was not simply the offspring of a body of clergymen. I should feel that their independence was a real gain to the Church, and that that sense of independence would very largely depend upon their being formed not upon lines which the bishops and clergy had laid down, but upon lines which more exactly represented their own minds. . . .

Under the circumstances the Archbishop was of opinion that the first step was to press for a reform of the clerical Convocations and their union in a united Synod, each Convocation being free to make bye-laws for the conduct of its own local concerns.

I want (he said) to unite the two, in order to make Canons and Regulations which will bind the whole Church in one.

The rest would follow in due course.

We must have the Houses of Laymen ; we shall never get

any real self-government without them ; but we must be very careful how we press anything upon Parliament which will in any way damage in the eyes of the people of England at large the independence of those Houses when formed.

The latest developments of the movement came at a time when the Archbishop's strength was beginning to fail and he was unable to retain his firm grip upon them. But the spirit which was conspicuous even in his latest attitude to the whole question contained its lesson, and will not be forgotten without danger—the manifest desire not to commit the National Church to any action which by relaxing its hold on past history should separate it from the National life and should fail to carry the religious sense of the people at large along with it.

3. To his sense of responsibility to the Faith and the Church must be added his sense of responsibility as Bishop and Primate for National life. The three things went together ; they would stand and fall together. The conviction came to him originally through his reading of Coleridge : "Christianity is not a Theory, or a Speculation ; but a *Life*. Not a *Philosophy* of Life, but a Life and a living Process."¹ Dr. Temple applied this principle to all doctrines—notably to the doctrine of Easter day. "Try to live by it," he says to the boys at Rugby : "Try to live as if that other world were immediately before your eyes ; try to live as if you were following your great Captain on the road to victory ; and, believe me, you will never find the doctrine stale or commonplace or powerless."² This conviction only deepened as he grew older. It accounts not only for his steadfastness in the cause of religious education, but for his devotion

¹ Coleridge's *Aids to Reflection*, p. 193, second edition. See also *supra*, p. 473.

² *Rugby Sermons*, vol. i. pp. 15, 16. New edition.

to the very end to the Temperance movement. To many it seemed that it argued some lack of the sense of proportion when an old man, Primate of the Church in critical times, devoted a large slice of his few remaining days to work in the Temperance cause; they thought that there was something incongruous in his going all the way to Scotland—to men hungering^d for pronouncements on dogma and ecclesiastical problems—and feeding them only with Temperance speeches. No doubt there was a touch of grim humour in the position; but the real solution was Dr. Temple's^f consciousness that while a final settlement about doctrine and questions of Church government would not be made in his time, it would be possible in the years at his command to go some way towards the settlement of practical problems; and that, after all, these had as much to do with the Faith and the Church as dogmatics and discipline. Did he not also know that there would never be wanting Archbishops anxious to deal with the high politics of doctrine and Church government, but that it was not so certain that many would have the same sympathy with the daily life of the people as circumstances and character had given him? He laboured most where he knew that he could do the most effective work.

Not that he neglected special measures of different kinds; his was no aimless Primacy. Its special occasions were the Ritual controversy, the Education crisis, the South African war. He met each with definite measures, based on the policy of finding fuller organic expression for the corporate unity and positive mind of the Church.

(a) For the Ritual trouble he had the momentary relief already at hand within the covers of the Church Prayer Book, namely, the resort “for the resolution of doubts” to the Archbishops; but he indicated the more permanent provision by urging

the formation of Councils of the Church, and by calling the Convocations and Lay Houses into joint Session.

(b) For the Educational crisis, in like manner, he turned to efforts to give solidarity to the Church's action, such as the formation of Diocesan Associations of Church schools, and the creation of the Church Central Council of Secondary Education. The following are his words on the former matter :—

To Archbishop Sandford

LAMBETH PALACE, April 30, 1897.

It is of very grave importance that we should if possible form our Associations under the Voluntary Schools Act on Diocesan lines. These Associations are certain as time goes on to become very weighty Bodies, and to give us for the first time a recognised organisation for expressing the mind of the Church on educational questions. The Act just passed is not the last word from the State; we have not reached a final settlement. Whenever the time comes for that, our hope of holding our own ground in the matter turns on the unity of our action. We have never yet got out of the isolation with which our Schools of necessity began, and because of that isolation we have never yet succeeded in making ourselves felt. We shall have far more power if we unite in large bodies than if (we) break ourselves up into small independent ones. It is most important to discourage in every way the tendency to put our own portion of the work assigned to each above the general duty of the whole.

The Education Department have already announced that they are unwilling to recognise any Association with fewer than 200 Schools. This shows the sort of Bodies they wish to deal with. It will be a grievous mistake to refuse to co-operate with them.

An Association based on the principle of getting as much of the Grant for itself as possible is hostile to the best interests of the Church.—Yours ever,

F. CANTUAR.

A few days later he spoke in Convocation on the subject :—

. . . My own opinion very decidedly is that it will be best that our voluntary schools should be associated as Church schools, and that we should not admit into this Church Association any outsiders who are not really acting on Church lines. I should not say this if I thought that in any case this would damage the education in the voluntary schools belonging to Nonconformist bodies, or to those who prefer what is called the undenominational system. I do not think that it will hurt them at all. For instance, we know that the Roman Catholics would refuse, even if we invited them, to join any association of ours. They will insist upon having associations of their own. . . . Their associations will represent the whole body of Roman Catholic opinion upon this question at every juncture when that opinion may be important. I do not see anything to prevent any other body of Nonconformists from following the same line. . . . In the same way, those who prefer an undenominational system may very easily form associations of their own, and I think that it would be best for them that they should do so. In dealing with these educational questions we are naturally thinking first of all of the religious education. We have been now for five-and-twenty years and more trying what sort of religious education we can possibly obtain from a combined system. The School Boards have a combined system. They give religious education, but in the first place it is distinctly curtailed by the refusal to permit any of the distinctive formularies of any denomination to be used; and in the second place, we find by experience that they practically decline to take any security that the schoolmasters shall be really religious men, and I do not think that it is of any use for us to go on any longer hoping to find that we shall get religious education that we entirely trust if we endeavour to unite the Church and the Nonconformists, or the Church and those who prefer secular education without any religion. It is quite true that there are some masters who can give a real, genuine, religious education without any reference to the points of difference which separate religious men. But the number of such masters and managers is unquestionably limited, and you constantly have a result which seems to me a very evil result—that you get masters teaching what they do not believe. I would rather that they left the religious education altogether alone than endeavour to teach something which they do not themselves believe, and for that reason I think that it is distinctly better that the different

bodies of Christians should work separately from one another in this matter. . . . I think that it is a much truer toleration to recognise the fact that we have differences from one another, and that, though we cannot see how to get over them or how to reconcile them, they yet are capable of reconciliation by our heavenly Father. God can see which is the real truth round which we are, as it were, gathered, and at which we are looking from different sides, and by that real truth which underlies the work, the work itself shall be judged. But it is not really possible for most of us to make any such distinction. The truest toleration that we can practise is practically to say, "We do not question your conscientiousness; we do not question that you have as much right to your view as we have to our view, but to us your opinion seems to be entirely wrong, and we cannot put that fact aside and say that we are willing to allow that it is right. We cannot do it." The religious teaching, if it is not really definite in most people's minds, fades away altogether into nothing which lays hold of the learner's heart and conscience. For this reason I think that these associations ought to be confined to Church schools.¹

The constitution and objects of the Church Council of Secondary Education have been mentioned in the previous chapter of this Supplement.²

(c) The South African war evoked much feeling for our sailors and soldiers, and deepened greatly at the time the sense of the Church's responsibility for their welfare. The Archbishop responded to this awakening of conscience in the matter by warmly supporting the movement for the formation of a Church Navy and Army Board, which originated in Convocation. The formation of this body recalls a wish expressed by him more than twenty years previously, that such work

¹ Chron. of Convocation, May 11, 1897. The terms on which the Archbishop personally desired that the permanent settlement of the Education question should be based were—that the *Church* should maintain both the buildings and the denominational instruction (if it could not do both, then in preference the denominational instruction), and that *Public Funds* should pay the cost of Biblical instruction. Chron. of Convocation, July 1901 (cp. "Primacy" Memoir, *supra*, p. 378).

² See p. 647.

should be taken up by the Church as a whole.¹ The Board was constituted with the concurrence of the naval and military authorities, and a large and representative gathering in support was held in the Church House, Westminster, on May 30, 1902. The first Lord of the Admiralty and the Secretary for War were amongst the speakers, and the Commander-in-Chief, Earl Roberts, wrote a letter, which has since been circulated, warmly recommending the undertaking. In the absence of the Archbishop, through illness, the chair was taken by the present Archbishop, who in succession to Dr. Temple is now the President. By its constitution the Board consists of representatives of the Navy and Army, and of the Convocations and Lay Houses, and accredited organisations in each diocese, and its aim is "to promote the moral and religious welfare of sailors and soldiers and their families, and to deepen the interest and strengthen the work of the Church in connexion therewith."² One of the latest public acts of the Archbishop was, shortly after this meeting, to carry through an arrangement by which the Chaplain of the Fleet was appointed an Archdeacon, and the Chaplains of H.M. Navy receive licences when appointed from the Archbishop of Canterbury.

In each of these three instances Archbishop Temple endorsed the practice and principle recommended and happily phrased by his predecessor as "the policy of setting the Church to do its own work"; it was the main feature of Dr. Temple's administration throughout. But the Primacy was crowned by greater things than these—the session of the third Lambeth Conference, the celebra-

¹ "Exeter" Memoir, vol. i. p. 474.

² Convocation of Canterbury. Report of Joint-Committee on Sailors and Soldiers, June 1900. Published by the National Society, London.

tion of the Diamond Jubilee of Queen Victoria, and the Coronation of King Edward VII. He met each worthily; for he responded to the call made by each with the spirit which was in him. Dignified and effective as chairman of the Conference, that which most commended him to the assembled bishops was the outflowing of his personality as it found expression in the closing words of his sermon preached in S. Paul's Cathedral at the adjournment of the Conference, August 2, 1897 :—

My brothers, we have lately come together, and we are about to part! What is it above all else that shall hold our hearts together, though we be parted by broad seas and vast extent of land? Will it not be that every man when he thinks of any other will feel—"he, too, is endeavouring to live in that Lord to whom I endeavour to give my life"? When we think of each other in our separation, while endeavouring to do the duties that the Lord has given us to do, should it not encourage us to remember always that there were so many of us gathered together to speak of the things of heaven and of the service of the Lord, and that, though they are scattered over the face of the earth, but one spirit remains within their hearts and ours? We shall find a unity with them in the endeavour to abide in Christ, and they, we know, will find a unity with us in the same endeavour. Each one will feel the support of all the rest, and each one will pray for the Lord's abundant blessing on all those with whom he once joined in solemn Conference. It is with this thought that I would desire to break up the Assembly of Bishops of all our Communion. With this thought we go away pledged to endeavour to abide in Christ, certain of the great promise that Christ will abide in us.¹

In all things it was the man that made the public servant. He represented, not chiefly special measures nor well-timed action, but his own manhood and all that it signified. In times of unrest he stood for the steady power of great truths; he met demands for speedy change, not by obstruc-

¹ *The Church of England Pulpit and Ecclesiastical Review.*

tion, but by progress based on principle; in the interests of the future, he looked back as well as forward; he supplied principles rather than plans or precedents. To the work of the Church he gave a life of labour and service; to the Archbishop's throne he gave himself. The man being what he was, it was a worthy offering for a great place.

And the offering was rendered possible by the atmosphere of the daily life. Frederick Temple was formed in a home, and his last years of highest service were fed by home life, and were true to the early conditions. He will be remembered as the Archbishop who had a passion for that kind of work which converts doctrine into life, and as one who greatly served the Church because he loved the home so well. The best commentary on his early years are the letters of the son to the mother; the closing years cannot be fully understood without the letters of the father to the son. They must be set the one against the other. It is as though in writing to his sons the old man was paying back part of the debt which he felt that he owed to his own mother. It is also as if he remembered the needs of the past and was trying to give the help which memory told him that he had needed himself. The letters throw new light on mind and character, illustrating much in him that was scarcely guessed at by the outside world. The whole correspondence follows the gradual development of the powers of young life: beginning with delightful nonsense, it ends with metaphysics and deep religious truth.

In the life of one who rises high in a public school, the best dividing line between childhood and the beginnings of manhood is probably the time when a boy enters the Sixth Form. It is well to follow this division. A very slight acquaintance with Dr. Temple would suffice to show that the

vein of frolic to which Professor Shairp refers in his well-known Oxford poem¹ never quite left him. The childhood of his sons revived it in full energy.

FIRST PERIOD

To William Temple (aged 6½)

FULHAM PALACE, *May 25, 1888.*

The bumble-bees are so many and they buzz so loud and so long that I cannot manage to write a long letter in answer to yours. I was very glad to get your Letter. Mother saw it first and took 'it away and opened it and read it. I hope that did not change it into something different from what it was before she saw it.

I have not found any Boys to amuse me. I wonder where they are all gone. Are they all eaten up? and cannot I have them any more?

ADDINGTON PARK, CROYDON.

The plague of boys
With all their noise
Is better than being without them.
Tell Mother to write
At once to-night
And tell me all about them.

FULHAM PALACE, *October 14, 1884.*

To-morrow is your birthday and I write to-day, having nothing whatever to say, just to prove that I have not forgotten you. You are now a man of immense age, and for seven years the number of your age will always end in "teen," a mystical syllable which indicates all sorts of very wonderful peculiarities. It rhymes to "bean," and indicates a donkey

¹ Comes brightly back one day—he had performed
Within the schools some more than looked-for feat,
And friends and brother-scholars round him swarmed
To give the day to gladness that was meet:
Forth to the fields we fared—among the young
Green leaves and grass, his laugh the loudest rung,
Beyond the rest his bound flew far and fleet.

Also see "Earlier Years" Memoir, vol. i. pp. 43-45.

full of beans and ready to kick. It rhymes to "green" and implies a delightful innocence always taken in by any and every hoax. It rhymes to "lean" and indicates the character of your bodily frame. It rhymes to "mean" and describes a character which you will never be, try ever so hard. Why on earth should your foolish father ever give you a thought? You do not often give him one.

In conclusion, Mr. Thirteen, I advise you to——

Letters full of banter and chaff—sometimes in English, sometimes, in Latin—follow in quick succession, with an underlying vein of occasional seriousness.

FULHAM PALACE, *February 17, 1895.*

Do you know a very bad Boy at Rugby who dares to write to me and send me impudent parodies of the *Frogs* of Aristophanes. They are not even good Greek. He writes $\beta\alpha\delta\ \delta\alpha\delta$, which no one can call Greek at all; and in fact no one can construe or translate it. It is evidently intended for impudence; but it is unintelligible impudence. If you come across that Boy just thrash him until he calls out $\beta\epsilon\pi\epsilon\kappa\epsilon\kappa\epsilon\ \kappa\omicron\alpha\varsigma\ \kappa\omicron\alpha\varsigma$ as loud as he can bawl.

He is not only impudent enough to write to me in this fashion, but he signs himself with your name; think of that!

Emittit signata tuo mala nomine verba
Quae poena est tanto crimine digna, precor?

Mind you don't get out of spirits because you have a cold. Consider that you really deserve something much worse, and it ought to be a great comfort to such a bad boy as you are that you are let off with so little discomfort. Therefore rejoice very much.

FULHAM PALACE, *May 20, 1895.*

MY DEAR WILLIAM— . . . Slacke puer, bangande puer, fis slackior tusque,

Crimen supplicio mox graviore lues—
Your tremendous FATHER.

FULHAM PALACE, *November 1, 1895.*

Gulielmo Temple puero impudentissimo Pater iratus S.D.
Habeto tibi misericordiam tuam: equidem contemno; te

tuamque insolentiam sperno. Quid? Num Rex es? num Victor? ut mei miserearis!

How are your eyes, you tiresome monkey? Can you see to read? or to eat?—Your wrathful FATHER.

FULHAM PALACE, *December 17, 1895.*

MY DEAR WILLIAM—Do you know what a dreadful thing is going to happen to this house next Friday? Two wild animals, just let loose from a large menagerie of such creatures in Warwickshire, are coming here to inflict themselves upon us. I advise you to keep out of their way until they are gone. I dare say you might find somewhere to hide; but, at any rate, don't come here, or perhaps they will devour you. I am in a great state of alarm myself. But I cannot hide because of the work I have to do.

Good lack what geese we be, to use a phrase of Queen Elizabeth's, adapted to the occasion. God bless you, dear boy.—Your own FATHER.

FULHAM PALACE, *February 8, 1896.*

You are abominably like that Father of yours whom I knew at school sixty years ago. He also almost always knew the sense of a passage, but got floored in the details of it. Nevertheless he was a better boy than you. He did sometimes (proh! pudor) make a false quantity, but I never knew him make a false concord. Moreover, though he was impudent now and then, there was a limit to *his* impudence.

FULHAM PALACE, *March 20, 1896.*

I quite understand. You are a very good boy. You hear that your Father has been laughed at. You indignantly declare that you wish you had been there. Of course you do. If you had been there you would have stopped it at once. I do not wonder at your indignation and your wish. You are evidently a very good, warm-hearted, right-minded, well-principled, justice-loving, high-souled, self-sacrificing boy.

The following letter tells of something deeper:—

FULHAM PALACE, *June 2, 1895.*

Thank you for writing to tell me of the death of my dear old friend.¹ It is indeed a grief to me. I have known him

¹ The Rev. Philip Bowden-Smith.

and his for nearly forty years; and a more unselfish man I never knew.

I hope you are finding enjoyment in this delightfully hot weather. I should find it very delightful if I had a moment's time to stop and feel the pleasure of it. God bless you, dear boy.—Your loving

FATHER.

The correspondence contains many instances of his desire to develop his own love for Biblical exegesis in his sons; they begin early:—

FULHAM PALACE,
December 18, 1896.

You ask me whether our Lord meant by the needle through which a man was to pass a gate so called or a common needle used by women in their work.

I think the latter. Our Lord did certainly use the Eastern method of teaching by exaggerations. Thus for instance the beam in your eye in S. Matthew vii. 3. The *δοκός* in that verse is a rafter in the roof of a house, rather decidedly a big thing for a man's eye. The exaggeration here is not less than in the needle.

And in both cases there is just that faint touch of fun which all Oriental teachers delight in.

Here is his view on the place of music, and the kind of instrument to be avoided:—

FULHAM PALACE,
November 7, 1895.

MY DEAR WILLIAM—I wish you had pitched on any other instrument than the French Horn. It is rather wasting time for any but a professional to learn what cannot be played except in company with others. But you shall have it if you like it.

Only remember that if I find music beginning to eat you up, I shall have to curtail it. You are not likely to make your living by music, and you will have to make your living. So keep the delightful art in check, and don't let yourself become a slave to such a master. God bless you, dear, dear lad.—Your loving

FATHER.

Here are two letters illustrating his press of work, and the straits he was put to in edging in his letters to his sons in the middle of it :—

FULHAM PALACE, *May 26, 1896.*

. . . We have begun the examination of the candidates for next Sunday, and I find it hard to get in a letter edge-ways. And this has been written, while one man was going and the next was coming, just about three lines at a time.

FULHAM PALACE, *June 2, 1896.*

. . . Eleven hours in the day of ear-marked time sounds like bondage, does it not? But such bondage occasionally comes on all of us. And it is a good thing that you have a little time left to do verses in; these, no doubt, you do between the end of each hour and the beginning of the next. I myself use these short intervals to sing songs, to take little naps, to write letters to my boys, etc., etc., etc. Whenever you expect a letter and do not get it, you may be sure that the hours, instead of leaving any intervals, have overlapped. Overlapping stops everything.

Here is a letter which shows what were the worst troubles in his busy life, how supreme was his desire to do justice, and how great a resource was home affection in anxious work :—

FULHAM PALACE, *February 23, 1896.*

. . . You don't know how hard I have been driven for the last fortnight. The letters and the interviews and the meetings and the sermons and the Confirmations hardly leave me time to breathe. And my own dear boys do not get half so much, or a quarter so much, of my attention as I ought to give them. . . . On the top of everything else has come some very painful business in dealing with people who have done very wrong, and that always takes much more time than anything else, lest by want of full knowledge of all the facts, one should do some injustice. I cannot say how I am longing for the next Rugby holidays.

The following letter speaks for itself:—

FULHAM PALACE, *October 24, 1896.*

MY DEAR WILLIAM—The Queen sends me to Canterbury. I should have somewhat preferred to stay in London. But the work of the Archbishop is very important just now, more important than the work in London. And I did not think it right to say no. Will you add to your private prayers a few words for me: "Give my dear father help and guidance for the work to which he has now been called."—Your own
FATHER.

It is a secret till to-morrow afternoon.

There was a lighter side to the grave responsibilities, and he was glad to have those about him who could help him not to be crushed by solemnities:—

LAMBETH PALACE, *April 4, 1897.*

. . . We are getting on very slowly with our Lambeth works. It will evidently be a good while yet before we shall finally get rid of the workmen. I shall be very glad when my boys come home to look at everything. But of course when you come here you will remember that Lambeth is not Fulham, and that you will have to be very careful not to indulge in any sauciness or cheek or even over-liveliness in so solemn a place as this.

Meanwhile, if you will love me as much as I love you, you will do very well.

Soon afterwards he greets his son's entry into the Sixth Form with much mock gravity:—

HOUSE OF LORDS.
May 7, 1897.

You in the Sixth! What are the Rugby School Authorities dreaming of? And how did you get the audacity to go into the Sixth when you had the offer? Ichabod, Ichabod! How has Rugby fallen!

But of course you are henceforth to be graver, and as for sauciness, we shall soon be able to say, He never could have been saucy; look at him.

I wish we could have you back again for an hour or so to see what you look like.

However, you are still my boy ; don't fancy that you have got out of that.

SECOND PERIOD

But the bridge has been passed, and the letters which follow—written during his younger son's later schooldays and the first* two years of his undergraduate course at Oxford—are set to a somewhat different strain. The letters are a gradual initiation into deeper things. The occasional touches of fun convert what would otherwise be lectures into delightful letters. The first may be regarded as an introduction to the whole series :—

CANTERBURY, *June 7, 1897.*

You asked me some questions the other day which I have not yet answered. . . . One question was whether Plato gave us the teaching of Socrates or put his own teaching into his former master's mouth. That is a question which never can be answered with certainty.

There can be no doubt that the method is that of Socrates. It was he who practised the art of cross-examining in such absolute perfection. And it has been said, and probably with some truth, that the Athenians put Socrates to death because he was such a bore with his incessant questions.

But I doubt if we can assert that the philosophy all belongs to Socrates. Probably the moral side is his. The lofty ideas of conduct ; the belief in immortality ; the subtle analysis of pleasure ; all that concern the fundamental questions of right and wrong. . . . But the intellectual side of Plato's work is, I think, Plato's. The doctrine that the Idea is the true essence and the Thing is but a copy or model of it ; that we had a preexistence and brought some of these Ideas with us from a former state ; that we are not to look to our bodily senses, but to our own intuitions to find out the laws that govern bodily things ; these and similar speculations are, I think, Plato's. . . .

LAMBETH PALACE, *April 2, 1898.*

By all means read Butler's *Analogy*. You will understand it well enough. But his style is heavy and you may find it dull.—Your own

FATHER.

In the Sixth Form a boy makes acquaintance with Lucretius, and if he has any taste for philosophy it is often first developed by that author. The rebound from the materialism of Lucretius was Kant—a big leap, but natural enough for Dr. Temple's son, and very soon the son is immersed in speculations on the relation of cause and effect, the ideas of time and space, the significance of real and phenomenal, the philosophy of the will, Aristotle's doctrine of the mean. The father gives careful answer on every subject, and now and again the reader of the letters is reminded of illustrations found in Dr. Temple's Bampton Lectures. There is an excellent first lesson on the doctrine of evolution. The year closes with a little poking of fun at the boy philosopher:—

LAMBETH PALACE, *May 14, 1898.*

Do not be in a hurry to accept Lucretius's doctrine of the eternity of matter. He held the atomic philosophy which is based on that principle. But it is obvious that the principle is absolutely incapable of proof. The Bible goes on the opposite principle that God created all things out of nothing, and as He could and can create, so also He can destroy. And it is surely a derogation from His supremacy if we hold that matter has an existence independent of Him. If the Moral Law, which is as it were His nature, is absolutely supreme, then Matter and the Laws of Matter must be dependent on Him for their existence.

If you wish to complete your idea of the Kantian Philosophy, add to the conception that Time and Space are not existent things, but part of the furniture of our minds, the further conception that the axiomatic principles of Physical Science, such, for instance, as the relation of Cause and Effect, are also furniture of our minds. We assert that everything

that happens must have a cause. Why?—because our minds could not otherwise perceive it. These Physical Principles are in fact like the machinery of a Kaleidoscope. A few bits of coloured glass are put into the Kaleidoscope with no regular order whatever. But when we look at them through the other end of the Toy they appear in a symmetrical pattern. So our minds act on the things that happen within the range of our perceptions.

LAMBETH PALACE, May 19, 1898.

You must not infer that when I make no objections to your speculations I have no objections to make. Thinking of this kind that you are now indulging is of value in proportion as one thinks out matters for one's self. And I interpose when I think my interposition will help you in that, and if I think you are likely to clear up your mind without my saying anything I say nothing.

You wonder why Butler takes no notice of Kant. The *Analogy* was published in 1736; Kant's *Philosophy* was published in 1781. You will read Kant some day; but I know no writer whose style is so clumsy and consequently so obscure, and it would break you down if you tried it now. I began it myself when I was just two years older than you are, and I found it a dreadful difficulty. . . .

I have said nothing about your remarks on Prayer because it is preeminently a matter which you must work out in your own mind. But I will remark that you do not yet possess the materials for dealing finally with the questions involved. You do not yet know all the forms that Prayer may take; you will have learnt something more about them ten years hence.

Probably about the time when you go to College, or it may be a little before that, you may learn a good deal from Lewis's *History of Philosophy*. Lewis is not a great philosopher himself, but he has a clear head and a lucid style and he puts things before you from a point of view which you would not be likely to reach by yourself.

CANTERBURY, June 3, 1898.

Your essay on Evolution was somewhat fragmentary and consequently not quite coherent. You had not present to your mind a clear conception of what the doctrine really was.

Now the doctrine of Evolution grew up in this way :

There had been floating about in men's minds for some time a fancy that things as we now see them were not always just such as they now appear, but in many cases grew out of previous forms by the operations of ordinary natural laws. Laplace applied this to Astronomy and pointed out that if we imagine a great mass of gaseous matter the force of gravitation would necessarily draw it together; that unless it was absolutely homogeneous the particles would move toward each other at different rates of speed; that the inevitable result of this would be that the whole mass would spin round its own centre; that thus it would spin faster and faster and at the same time harden first into a liquid then into a semi-solid state; that the outer crust would lose its heat faster than the inside and would consequently harden sooner; that as it grew hard and heavy the centrifugal force caused by the spin would make this outer crust fall off and roll up into a separate ball; that in this way planets would be formed; and so you would have our Solar System. Geologists examined the earth and for a long time discoursed on the effects of cataclysms of water and sudden eruptions of fire, until Sir Charles Lyell pointed out that there was no need to invent cataclysms or catastrophes, because the slow operation of the laws of nature as we know them would account for all the observed phenomena. The same thought was applied by Lamarck and others to Animated Nature. And this application was as a rule ridiculous. When it is gravely suggested that men are monkeys who have got rid of their tails partly by never using them to climb with and partly by sitting on them, Science is at a very low ebb.

But the doctrine of Evolution was suddenly brought into a new position by the publication of Charles Darwin's *Origin of Species*.

He pointed out that children in *most* particulars resembled their parents; but never in *all*. The slight differences between them and their parents were sometimes transmitted to the next and to many succeeding generations. By this means through a long accumulation of such variations from the original stock the children of to-day were sometimes quite unlike the progenitors of 10,000 years ago, and also quite unlike other descendants from the same progenitors. Thus new species were formed. This multiplication of species is perpetually checked by the perishing of a good many through the competition for food, for protection from cold, for protection from enemies; in this competition the species that

had developed into unfavourable forms were got rid of. And the species that established themselves finally were the survivors after this competition. The survival of the fittest was the rule of life.

And one of the strongest arguments for believing that species were formed in this way was the survival of the useless. Not the survival of useless species, but of useless parts of the body.

Thus the well-known slow-worm, which to all appearance is a snake, turns out when dissected to be a lizard. Under its skin it has four short beginnings of feet. These are of no use to it whatever. They are survivals from a generation of lizards which used their feet.

In the human body there is a part of the bowel which used to be called the blind bowel or cæcum, but is now generally called the appendix. It is of no use whatever; indeed, it is a danger, for the food can get in and cannot easily get out, and sometimes causes inflammation by staying too long. It is a survival of the useless. It belongs to a generation of long, long ago when it really did good. There are animals in whom it is found now, fulfilling a useful purpose. By such arguments Darwin showed how many unaccountable facts might be accounted for. So he put the Theory of Evolution on a Scientific basis. And the men of Science very soon were infected by the conception and began to extend it to all Creation.

In some important particulars they have been entirely baffled. Their researches have never shown that Life has been evolved out of Non-life. Every living creature as far as prolonged investigation goes comes from a preexisting living creature. Many scientific men are sorely vexed at this incompleteness in the Universality of Evolution, and some refuse to believe that there can be any such incompleteness. I am afraid I cannot sympathise with their vexation.

You have asked me some questions which I will answer, but not now.

LAMBETH PALACE, *June 30, 1898.*

I have not written to you for a long time, because I have had so much writing to do that my eyes became too sore for writing any more. Now I have a slight release and so I will answer some of your questions.

. . . First, you asked some time ago whether Kant would call two events such as the assassination of Julius Cæsar and

the execution of Charles I. simultaneous. I was surprised at the question. When I told you of Kant's doctrine of Free Will I remarked that Arthur Clough, when I told him of this, said, "This seems to me like saying that I was free once, but am free no longer," and you acutely said, "How could he speak of 'am' and 'was': if Time is subjective, there can be no past, present, or future, and therefore no am, or was, or will be." The same thing is to be said of the word simultaneous. Past, present, and future are different times. Simultaneous means of the same time. Different means not the same; and same means not different. If you cannot speak of different times, neither can you speak of the same time.

Next you ask me the difference between *γνώσις* and *σοφία*. In such cases the leading clue to the meaning is to be found in the etymology. Both these words are Greek; the etymological clue fails with words imported from a different language. *Σοφία* is the characteristic of the *σοφός*; the man comes first, the quality comes out of it. *Σοφία* therefore means something *in* the man. It is a quality flowing out from within, not added on from without. It may be increased; but it is increased by use; by meditation, by application to conduct, by contact with other *σοφοί*; not by accretion.

Γνώσις comes from the verb; it is not *in* the man to begin with; it is a product of the man's action; he brings it in from outside; he may increase it enormously. Kant in one place remarks that a man may be exceedingly learned and yet very stupid. After all the English words Wisdom and Knowledge correspond very well to the Greek words. And Wisdom is *in* the man, and Knowledge comes in from the outside. . . . I will add one thing more to all this. Kant grew out of a hint given by Leibnitz. The Schoolmen had pressed all philosophy on the lower lines until they summed up all philosophical process in the words, "Nihil in intellectu quod non prius in sensu." This goes straight to materialism. The acceptance of Revelation was made to depend on Miracles and on nothing else. Locke on the Understanding is the perfection of this theory. Leibnitz corrected this by adding to the dogma the words "Nisi ipse intellectus." You can see how this let in Kant in a flood.

Do not call pride a virtue. If a man tells a lie and then finds that this has done great injustice, is it a virtue to be too proud to confess what he has done?

LAMBETH PALACE, July 9, 1898.

The saying that every Virtue is a mean is *me jultice* superficial; one of those plausibilities into which Aristotle, great as he was, occasionally slipped, and which lay hold of men because they are so very plausible. They are such as used to make my old Master say, "Deep thought; I have often made the same observation myself."

Aristotle, however, did not mean any Virtue in its essence; but in its exhibition. What you do if you are virtuous, not what you are, will always lie between two modes of action, extremely opposed to each other. Even so it is a superficial saying.

December 1, 1898.

Do you not think that giving presents to your father is rather lowering to the dignity of a Philosopher.—What would Kant think of it?

By the end of the year (1899) Coleridge and Bacon had been added to Kant. The father's preference for the more spiritual philosophy comes out at every turn, and it is impossible not to read his own history into the letters, nor to note the wisdom of the counsels and cautions—some of them drawn from his own past experience:—

LAMBETH PALACE, July 2, 1899.

I can neither say yes nor no to your speculations and to Coleridge's speculations on the Formula Fidei de Sanctissimâ Trinitate. At this point Coleridge and I always parted company. I cannot understand him; and I have never been able to feel sure that he understood himself.

Nevertheless, I am obliged to confess that from seventeen to five-and-twenty I indulged largely in such speculations. But I felt all along like a swimmer who sees no shore before him after long swimming, and at last allows himself to be picked up by a ship that seems to be going his way.

I do not want to check your imaginings. Go on as long as you feel that you get any good at all by doing so. But I rather fancy you will come to the same end as I came to long before you. My passing ship was S. John.—Your loving
FATHER.

OLD PALACE, CANTERBURY,
December 9, 1899.

I do not wonder that in many ways you should prefer Bacon to Kant. Bacon writes in a perfect style. Kant's style is execrable. Kant was quite conscious of his deficiency in this respect. But on the other hand Kant was handling a far more difficult matter, and kept himself on a higher level of thought. Bacon's tendency is somewhat utilitarian. He is always seeking for "fruit," and often gives one the impression that he valued science not for itself but for its results. Kant would never have ended in Paley; Bacon has a strong tendency to make Paley the end of true philosophy. From that Kant is free.

I know that in comparing the two there is much to be said on the other side. But nevertheless——

The letters in the succeeding years increasingly bring together metaphysics and theology. What the Archbishop says about progress shows his sense of the danger which may arise from too exclusive a cult of metaphysics. His fears are summed up in one sentence: "The danger of your speculations is that if you do not take care you will lower your idea of God."

LAMBETH PALACE, January 29, 1900.

When you say there is no such thing as Progress it becomes necessary to have recourse to the distinction drawn by the Mediæval Schoolmen between what is true *simpliciter* and what is true *secundum quid*.

It is true enough that, as far as we can see, human nature remains ever the same, and that as Ecclesiastes tells, Whatever the progress the result after all is only "man."

But on the other hand there is real progress in Science, and indeed in all knowledge, including knowledge of human nature; and there is real progress in that which is based on knowledge, *e.g.* in legislation, in the customs of life, in comfort both of body and mind; and to go higher there is real progress in moral conduct, perhaps none in moral principle.

Human nature still contains the elements of selfishness, of cruelty, of falsehood, of lust, of vanity, and all these things and others like them, as bad, as universal as ever.—But the

practice is ever more and more restrained. And that is a real, though not a fundamental progress.

The Life of Christ tells on man by slow degrees, and its effect can be traced and pointed out. But the fundamental change belongs not to the world of phenomena.

LAMBETH PALACE, *February 13, 1900.*

I think you are getting into rather risky speculations. If the Perfect Man is not by Incarnation but in himself God, he must not only be Omnipotent as you suppose but Omniscient. It is rather difficult to accept this. But, anyhow, you are getting a good way beyond Kant. He based his Philosophy on undeniable facts. He took his ground as regards space on the undoubted fact that our intellect claimed to possess a universal knowledge independent of experience. I know that two and three make five not only here but in the distant planet Saturn. How do I know it? The answer is plain if Space is a form in my own mind; but if it be a thing existing independently of me, no explanation can be given at all, and the universality of our knowledge of the properties of space is an ultimate fact with which we begin, but for which we cannot account.

But when you claim that the Will is omnipotent, you have no basis of fact at all. It is not merely an hypothesis, but an hypothesis that explains nothing.

Again, we know for certain that what has once happened cannot be cancelled. No power you can conceive will make that undone which was once done. How do we know this? We cannot tear the knowledge of it out of us. This is explained if Time and Sequence, which is of the essence of Time, are a Form of our mode of perception. Otherwise our knowledge of it remains inexplicable. But if Time be a form of our minds we can then conceive that to God there is [? no.—Ed.] Time, and sequence must present itself to Him in some Form quite different from sequence as we know it.

LAMBETH PALACE, *February 15, 1900.*

MY DEAR WILLIAM—I was obliged to stop when last I wrote before I had said all I wanted to say. And I have only a few minutes now.

The danger of your speculation is that if you do not take care you will lower your idea of God.

Will your perfect man be omnipresent at every moment?
—Your most affectionate and loving FATHER.

LAMBETH PALACE, *February 5, 1901.*

The young Kantian must be always on his guard lest he slip unconsciously into the religion of the Gipsies :

Yea God and man, the future and the past,
Are but to them one chaos dark and vast ;
One gloomy present, one unchanged to-day,
Stirred by no storm and brightened by no ray.

For the Kantian Theory is that we cannot know Things as they are ; we only know their manifestations, moulded for us by the forms of Time and Space. But we find it very difficult to be content with this, and we are perpetually striving to get at the knowledge of things as they are. So we slip into the fancy that if we strip away Time and Space the remainder will be the things as they are. But that is not so. We cannot really strip away time and space. Take time by itself. There is a sequence of events in time which may be represented by a line. Strip away the line and put all events into a point. But a point is still a point of time, and so you have still got time involved in your conception.

And when you apply this to conduct it becomes a serious matter. I try to persuade a man to give up drunkenness. I succeed. The man lives a changed life. You say No ; he is not really changed ; he is just the same. I reply you are talking nonsense ; the word the "same" means "the same as before," which is an expression that belongs to time and is quite inapplicable here. To say "is not the same" would be equally nonsense.

I say there is a change in him as manifested here ; and there must be a reality in him corresponding to this manifestation, but what that reality is I know not.

Progress in this world is a good thing, and the reality which corresponds to progress must therefore be a good thing too. For the character "good" is independent of time altogether.

I advise you to stop trying to find out the true nature of Things in themselves ; for Time and Space are a part of you, and you cannot do without them.—Your loving father,

F. CANTUAR.

The three following letters are entered somewhat out of date, but they touch on Dr. Temple's favourite subjects in such matters—the philosophy

of the will and the distinction between external and internal authority—and may well serve to close this part of the correspondence:—

LAMBETH PALACE, *October 17, 1900.*

You give me a very hard nut to crack when you ask me to identify the ancient and the modern modes of regarding the construction of the human soul. They cannot be identified; the one is based on a different conception from the other.

The ancients never thought of the Will as a Faculty at all. They identified the Will with the man, and looked on the reason, the temper, the appetite, as faculties under the man's control. . . . Modern thinkers have come to regard the Will as one of the faculties, and generally put *θυμός* and *ἐπιθυμία* together under the name of the "passions" or the "appetites."

This account of the matter may perhaps help you to understand the relation of Coleridge's man to Plato's.

CANTERBURY, *November 20, 1900.*

I am ashamed of having left several letters of yours unanswered. But the work has been very heavy and has taken up all the time for thinking that I had; and the subjects that you write about cannot be handled without thinking.

I will say something about the Will, in regard to which I find myself disagreeing from a good deal that you write.

The New Testament as it appears to me always maintains to the utmost the freedom of the Will. Even the inspiration of the "prophets" in the New Testament is declared to be subject to their Will. "The spirits of the prophets are subject to the prophets." It rests on the responsibility of man for his action: a man cannot be held responsible if he is not free.

Hence it is that the gift of the Holy Spirit does not always suffice to guide the man aright. Unless he co-operates with the Spirit the Spirit is ineffective; he receives the gift in vain.

All Christians receive the Holy Spirit, but not all Christians are directed by that Spirit. They can and do disobey. They can and do quench. The Spirit meanwhile is there and at work, doing just as much in a man as is good for that

man and is consistent with his freedom. Feelings are stirred ; thoughts are suggested ; in moments of spiritual struggle strength is given ; and yet the man may refuse to co-operate ; and then the work of the Spirit is like the seed in the Parable, and either brings no fruit at all or brings no fruit to perfection.

All spiritual growth depends on the action of the Will. But it is going too far to say that when there is no effort of the Will the emotion does harm or even that it is not good. We are of a compound nature, and much that is not spiritual is nevertheless good. The emotion which is not controlled by the Will, when it ought to be, is hurtful. But it is not hurtful if the Conscience does not call on the Will to control. The pleasure of eating strawberries is not hurtful if the conscience does not forbid the eating, and the Will is consequently passive. If it arouses an emotion of gratitude it is possibly useful. The pleasure of beautiful music even, if the Will be quite passive, is nevertheless good. It very often purifies and even elevates the emotion. The Will may be quite passive when a man is looking at a beautiful view ; yet the beauty of it will do good to the man's soul, will soften his heart, will refine his taste, and will make his emotions better instruments for the Will to use when the Conscience calls on the Will to use them.

Health of body is often quite independent of the Will —yet is a blessing and makes the body a fit instrument for higher things.

See where you differ from me in all this and tell me why. But perhaps when you have thought it all over you may find that you do not differ.

CANTERBURY, *December 4, 1900.*

I do not think that you can say that S. Paul means by the Law what Kant means by the "Categorical Imperative." To say this implies that S. Paul had worked out his philosophy much more than he really had.

S. Paul always, as I think, has in his mind the contrast between an external and an internal rule. The Law in his idea is not the Law of Moses, but it is any rule whatever which attempts to guide conduct by something outside the man. It is opposed to the spirit which always means a guidance from within. The Categorical Imperative would fall within S. Paul's idea of Law if it were imposed by an authority which was felt to be external. But if and when

and where the man's own spirit accepts it and lives by it in consequence of inner conviction it is Law no longer; it is the action of the spirit itself. . . .

The notes of a sermon on "I can do all things through Christ which strengtheneth me" form a good supplement to the teaching on the power of the will:—

Philippians iv. 13, "I can do all things through Christ which strengtheneth me."

The Resurrection a witness to our immortality. This the first lesson it teaches, and undoubtedly the highest. We learn by it the law of our being, which is thus revealed not to science but to faith.

But that is not the only lesson. And though no other can be put by the side of that, it is treated by the New Testament as teaching the further lesson which, though less important, is more immediate—the restoration, we may say the resurrection, of the Will.

So is it connected with Baptism, for it teaches the death unto sin and the life unto righteousness. . . .

We fancy that we are not made of the same materials as the men who have attained to great sanctity. We think that their obedience must be due to some special gifts which are not bestowed on every man. And we are hopeless of rising to their level. But God has made no such difference. One of the greatest servants of God was the Prophet Elijah, and yet the New Testament by the mouth of S. James declares him to be of like passions with ourselves.

And sometimes we confuse ourselves by not distinguishing between the spiritual life and the particular vocation. It is true that we have different vocations. One man is called to serve in one way and another in another. Illustrations of this abound. But holiness is possible in every vocation. The highest of all gifts is Charity. And charity is not a particular vocation, but is open to everybody: to teach yourself to live for others. Your service may not be so conspicuous, but it shall rank as high: to teach yourself to love God. That love may burn in your heart and yet may not be known among your fellows as anything remarkable. It is quite impossible to say that all men are equal in saintliness. We do not know enough to judge. Nay, it is impossible to say that the ultimate

difference between man and man is invariably due to difference of endeavour. But it is certain that the power to move steadily upwards is given to every Christian. The power to say "I can do all things through Christ" is not given to S. Paul alone, but to all Christian souls. Different opportunities and vocations are given to different (men); but the power to (do) all through Christ is given to every man, and to every man is addressed the call which those words convey.

In the previous letters philosophy and theology are intermingled, and shade off into each other. Those which follow deal exclusively with the latter subject. The letter on inspiration is a natural introduction to those connected with others on Biblical exegesis. It puts succinctly the views with which all who have read this Memoir and studied Dr. Temple's writings are familiar:—

OLD PALACE, CANTERBURY,
November 21, 1898.

Your delightful letters often contain questions which I cannot answer without thinking, and I have no time to think because the Church in the Colonies, and the Church in the United States, and above all the Church here in England fill up all the thinking power that I possess.

Nevertheless I delight in your letters, and I dare say in course of time I shall deal with all that you have put before me.

I agree with you in thinking that Plato had an inspiration from God as real as that which was given to Isaiah. But there was this great difference: Isaiah knew that he was inspired; Plato did not. It is not the inspiration that makes the Bible a different Book from any other that ever was written. It is the perpetual consciousness of the inspiration. This culminated in our Lord. The people were struck with the fact that He spake with authority and not as the Scribes.

I who have read the Bible regularly for nearly seventy years always feel that if my conscience differs from the Bible I must pause. It may be my conscience wants enlightenment. It may be that I do not rightly interpret the Bible. But I do not feel the same with any other book.

The four letters interpreting passages in the Epistle to the Hebrews must have been exceedingly helpful to a Sixth Form boy studying that part of the Bible in school; and any reader of the Epistle will find them suggestive:—

LAMBETH PALACE, *February 28, 1900.*

. . . In regard to *ὑπόστασις* you must remember that you cannot gain anything by confounding a thing and a thought. Faith and Truth, you say, are not correlative but identical. This is good rhetoric; but it is rhetoric, not logic. Faith, being the action of the human soul, cannot be identical with Truth, which is independent of the human soul, and would remain the same if no human soul existed. But you are right in your account of the writer's meaning. He means precisely what you say; but he is, and knows he is, using rhetoric, and if we are to explain the meaning to ordinary readers we must give them the logic which corresponds to his rhetoric. It is in that way, and in that way only, that we can help readers to find what it is within themselves that he means. Instead of "substance" use "reality"; faith is the reality of things hoped for; that is, their reality to the man who hopes; that is, their realisation.

LAMBETH PALACE, *June 23, 1900.*

I have a little time at my disposal this evening, and I will try to give you my account of Hebrews, ch. x.

The underlying thought is that expressed in our Lord's words to S. Peter (S. John's Gospel xiii. 10). The *λελουμένος* needeth not save to wash his feet.

There is a state of sin which keeps a man, as it were, apart from God. The *λελουμένος* has passed out of that state; but he is still a sinner; he still needs to wash his feet. He has passed out of the state of wilful sin; his will is cleansed; but he still sins from infirmity, from blindness, from sudden temptation.

The Law and all its sacrifices could not bring a man into the position of the *λελουμένος*. Nothing could do so but the sacrifice on the Cross. The man who was purified by the sacrifices of the Law was still conscious of his being out of God's favour, was still cut apart from Him. The sacrifice of the law was enough to procure a remission of sins, not enough to procure a freedom from their grasp.

The *λελουμένος* was conscious that he was reconciled to God, and in that consciousness had a strength altogether new to deal with every temptation, and though he would still fail, and fail often, he would nevertheless be still in God's favour, and so enabled in God's strength to beat down Satan under his feet.

I send this to-day: more to-morrow.

LAMBETH PALACE, *June 24, 1900,*

Bearing in mind the distinction between sin which separates from God and sins or infirmities which do not, the writer of the Epistle urges that the old sacrifices never showed the power to do away with the former; the original evil remained unaffected, and in some form or other the sin was still in the soul. The sin was not really forgiven, but only passed by. If it had been forgiven it would have been removed. But if a man repenting of a dishonest or a cruel or an impure act finds that after offering the legal sacrifice he cannot abstain from a repetition of the act, it is clear that he has not been made perfect. He is really where he was. Even if the former act of sin is guarded from punishment, the sin of which it was at the time the fruit is left untouched. These old sacrifices failed because they had no spiritual power. But when the Saviour comes into the world the 40th Psalm becomes applicable to Him. It is not the law that is required to equip Him for His task; it is the absolutely perfect obedience which proves that man, *i.e.* human nature, is capable of casting off sin even to the length of carrying obedience to the point of death, and promises to impart that capacity to those who give themselves to Christ. "Mine ears hast Thou opened" and "A body hast Thou prepared for me" both mean absolute obedience. This obedience of Humanity is the true atonement, in which all men share who by the complete surrender of their will identify themselves with Him who rendered it to God on the Cross. For this identification of ourselves with Christ, whereby we crucify the affections and lusts, lifts us to that higher level where we are partakers in the sacrifice which He made. By the doing of God's will, He doing it for us, and we sharing with Him in the doing of it, we are made holy.

Other Priests offer sacrifices, but the sacrifices are merely figures to point to the One True Sacrifice, and they convey no grace to the souls of the offerers. Christ alone has offered

the sacrifice which cleanses all Human Nature, and He now sits on His Father's throne waiting till this great Act shall work itself out in human history, till His enemies are all crushed, and He is visibly supreme.

And all this is proved by the words of the Prophet that the new Covenant between God and His people will consist in putting His laws into their hearts and writing these laws in their minds. Compare this with the great passage in the seventh chapter of the Epistle to the Romans and you will see that the teaching is identical.

S. Paul says that he one day found out that he had been entirely mistaken in fancying himself alive, *i.e.* in favour with God. He was not keeping nor trying to keep the Tenth Commandment. And as long as he remained under the Law, *i.e.* under a system which neither gave nor promised to give any supernatural aid to the soul, he found that in that state he must remain. When he surrendered himself to Christ he found that he could by Christ's grace crucify the affections and lusts, and his sin would pass away and he would be enabled to conquer all its manifestations, if not at once, yet in course of time. The difference between Romans vii. and Hebrews x. is that in the former passage the contrast is between the strength given by Christ and the unaided effort of man; and in the latter between the strength given by Christ and that given by the legal sacrifices.

The rest of the tenth chapter goes on to speak of the *απολούμενος* who gives up his place and cuts himself off from Christ and denies the faith which he had once accepted: the man who, having entered into "the holiest," *i.e.* the very presence of God, by a new and living way which Christ has opened for us through His Humanity into His Divinity, nevertheless falls back, forgets the glory he has seen and the promises he has heard, and slips into infidelity.

Now I have given you my own view of the passage, and you will be able in a few days perhaps to tell me how it squares with yourself and your own meditations. I shall have, I believe, somewhat more time to attend to you than I have had of late.

LAMBETH PALACE, July 1, 1900.

You must not suppose that because I interpret Hebrews x. as I do I mean to condemn the idea that the writer had in his mind the vision of a Heavenly Temple with parts similar to those of the Earthly Temple. On that I pronounce no

opinion, but as far as I see this does not throw much light on the doctrine which the writer means to teach. But perhaps I might in this respect modify my view if I could study the book which James has been studying. Tell me the name of the book. I think I will get it and give a little time to it.

But anyhow I cannot think that the *καταπέτασμα* is a barrier. The purpose of it was not to hinder intrusion, but to conceal. The High Priest went through it, and our way to the Holy of Holies is through our Lord's humanity, which is the veil that hides from us our Lord's Divinity. The new and living way for man to reach the very presence of God is to go through the Humanity of Christ.

Hence the great sacrament of our perpetual admission is through His Flesh, that is, His Humanity. It is by partaking of His Body and Blood that we, becoming one with Him, pass with Him into the very Holiest of all conditions. It is union with His Humanity that He offers us when He bids us eat His Flesh; and for this reason it is that He has attached that Sacrament not to His Resurrection but to His Crucifixion.

LAMBETH PALACE, *March 12, 1900.*

You cannot safely argue from what is said of a causeless curse to what might be said of a causeless blessing. Jacob was blessed; Esau was not cursed. Nor can you safely argue from what is said of a human curse or a human blessing, to what would be said of a divine curse and a divine blessing. The blessing pronounced on Jacob was not based on any merit in Jacob, but on the fact that he happened to be the most effective instrument for carrying into effect the Divine Will.

Why were the chosen people chosen? Not, we are repeatedly told, for their goodness.

As far as I can see, they were chosen for their toughness. No other race has shown the same tenacity in holding fast their old faith and their old law. In particular, their obstinacy made them superior to all other races of their day in sexual morality. The contrast drawn between Gentiles and Jews set before us in the first and second chapters of the Epistle to the Romans is historically true; and that contrast is mainly due to the superior toughness of the Jewish race.

The Greek tragedians, as you rightly say, made the

causeless curse work itself out, and they never rose to the height of seeing that a curse that had no righteous cause can have no real effect. Even Sophocles did not attain to that.

April 22, 1901.

Nothing is more tempting and nothing is more fallacious than to make conjectural emendations of past writers on merely internal evidence. S. Luke in the opening sentences of his Gospel seems to imply that he had read, and probably that he had used, the writings of previous narrators of our Lord's life and sayings. And we may fairly expect to find the incoherences which are frequent in such compilations. But the moment we begin to assign motives we are stepping on unsafe ground.

I think a comparison of S. Luke xxii. 14-20 with S. Paul, 1 Cor. xi. 23-25, is enough to show that S. Luke got his account of the institution of the Lord's Supper from S. Paul. And this makes it probable that S. Paul had a good deal to do with S. Luke's whole account of the Passion and Crucifixion. I see no trace of an adaptation to make the narrative accord with S. Matthew's. S. Luke xvi. 18 is, as you say, a striking instance of incoherence, but there are not many such. If chapter xvi. is an extract from an earlier writer there may have been something in a previous portion of the extract which would account for these words appearing here. It is, of course, quite *possible* that alterations may have been made in S. Luke's Gospel before it assumed its present shape, but I find no evidence of this. And I think if there had been such alteration we should have had such evidence.

The correspondence contains letters which touch on points of moral conduct as well as theology. The question of the association of the young with those whose standard is not high, for the purpose of raising it, is marked by the usual soundness of judgment. The advice may be serviceable to masters and boys alike:—

March 14, 1900.

Whatever may be your duty in regard to a fellow who is not all right, the headmaster's duty is clear. He is entrusted by their parents with the highest interests of a great number of boys. He is bound to consider what is best for them.

Even if it be your duty to run risks, it does not follow that he is justified in allowing not you only but ever so many others to run such risks. If he judges that he would not allow a son of his own to run risks from bad companionship, he is bound to give the same protection to the son of another man.

As regards yourself the matter is different, and turns much on what you find to be the result of seeking the companionship of any one whose life you disapprove. Does your companionship amount to a condonation of his wrong-doing? If so, you are doing him harm and not good. Do you find his companionship have the effect of lowering your own standard of what is right? If so, he is the eye, the foot, the hand that makes you stumble, and that must be cut off at whatever cost.

S. Paul's passionate language expresses his feelings, not his purpose, and it is not based on desire to do good, but on his overwhelming love of his countrymen. Our Lord died for us; but He did not sin for us, and the one thing human that He did not take was sin.

And most assuredly S. Paul, if he felt that his loyalty to Christ was in peril, would not have preferred to that loyalty even his love for his countrymen.

The whole of the correspondence is a crown to the life of a great educator. The letters were written in moments snatched from a life crowded with work. The mere thought of the strain to failing eyesight involved in writing them calls out admiration. There have been few like them; they teach a perpetual lesson to parents.

In reading these letters we have entered the inner circle of the Archbishop's life. The rough manner, the grim humour, and the pithy, pungent sayings, amuse intimate friends, but they are not the first and last things which come up in their minds in thinking of him. They were not, however, mere excrescences, but parts of the man; they were in the face, and whatever his face said had its counterpart in the mind, and no record of Dr. Temple is complete without some mention of them. They did not greatly strike boys, in

whom the sense of humour is less quick than the appreciation of fun. The humour grew in later life when circumstances were most favourable to its development. As years advanced the tone of it became mellow and kinder, but to the very last his speech was seasoned with crisp, curt utterances. When the news came, during his last illness, that the Bishop of Manchester's Amendment¹ in the Education Bill had been passed, he was told at once. "That's my speech," he exclaimed. "But it's a breach of privilege; there'll be a grand row"—said with quite a fighting ring in the voice. He was asked what would happen if the Commons refused to consider the Amendment in consequence. "I expect there would be a conference of the two Houses," was the reply. "If there is, I must go. I could make a speech, and convince 'em too." Later on he said, "If there's a joint session of the two Houses, I must go; I shan't come back, but I must go."

The humour was always under control, but it was no respecter of persons or occasions. The day after the collapse in the House of Lords he wished to get up to attend the Bishops' meeting. When asked to stay in bed, he said, "What? Not go to the Bishops' meeting! Why, they'll all get into mischief."

"I think, your Grace, it may save time if I rise to move," said a Bishop at the Lambeth Conference. "You can save more time by sitting still."

To a vicar pointing to the Nonconformist Chapel:—

"That is where all the people go, my Lord."
"WHY?"

¹ Allowing managers to charge for wear and tear of school furniture.

To a vicar plucking his sleeve, after many attempts to make him listen, and saying aloud :—

“We always say the words once for a whole rail-full.”

“You won’t do it, to-day.”

To an incumbent desiring leave of non-residence :—

“The house in which I propose to live, my Lord, is only a mile from the boundary of the parish as the crow flies.”

“You are not a crow, and you can’t fly.”

At a public luncheon :—

“May I give your Grace some of this cold chicken?”

“No, you may not; wherever I go they give me cold chicken and the ‘Church’s one foundation,’ and I hate them both.”

To a hostess who had prepared many dainties, and to whom it was particularly necessary that the Bishop should be polite :—

“Will you take some of this trifle, my Lord?”

“No, thank you.” And then, quite unconsciously, “Have you any dry bread?”

There is more depth and more of the Bishop’s mind on such subjects than is always caught by those who smile at the well-known story :—

“Do you believe in Providential interference, my Lord?”

“That depends on what you mean by it.”

“Well, my aunt was suddenly prevented from going a voyage in a ship that went down—would you call that a case of Providential interference?”

“Can’t tell; didn’t know your aunt.”

“Please, sir, will Mr. — have the form when Mr. — gives it up?” No answer.

When the questioner was gone: “The boys always know the right thing to do, but they don’t always know the difficulty of doing it.”

It was the Bishop's habit always to throw anonymous letters into the fire without reading them. Seeing that a visitor looked surprised when a letter was thrown into the fire unread, he explained :—

"Do you know why I did that? It's an anonymous letter. When I was a young man at the Council Office, I had to decide on the claims of two men for a certain post; they stood very even, but some time before, I had received an anonymous letter against one of them, and I found it so hard in making the decision to get that letter out of my head that I resolved that I would always burn anonymous letters in future."

He was amused in adding what once came of this habit :—

When I was at Rugby, a dignified old officer, very conscientious but starchy, was once shown into the room. "Dr. Temple, I called to say that on reflection I greatly regret having sent you an anonymous letter the other day!"

"Oh, pray, sir, make your mind quite easy; I never read anonymous letters."

The officer in great indignation: "What, sir, not read *my* letter!"

Few things were more distasteful to him than being asked to reopen a question already settled. To an importunate friend wanting to "come and talk the matter over again" he writes :—

DEAR ———,—You can come if you like, but you'll waste your time and mine.—Yours ever,

F. EXON.

But he relented sometimes, and if his mind were not absolutely made up would even ask for reconsideration. On one such occasion he ended characteristically, "Well, I don't agree, but it shall be as you suggest." And then as the arch-deacon was leaving the room, "Mind, if things go wrong, I'll take the blame." What wonder that he was well served!

Foreigner : "It seems to me that most things in England are five to six."

Archbishop : "Yes, and the wise man is he who looks at both sides, and then goes in with all his might for the one that has the extra point in its favour."

Archbishop : "You know these two men well, A and B—which do you place first?"

Friend : "Oh, B, certainly."

Archbishop : "Why, for one man whom B would influence, A would influence twelve." After a pause : "I don't say that the one man influenced by B isn't worth all the twelve put together."

When told of a clergyman who had got into a mess with his parishioners by being a party politician : "If a clergyman is to take up politics, he must be a *very strong* man."

Statesman : "I can always get on with Temple. He's rough, but he's straight, and you always know what he means."

The power of pregnant speech told in the deepest discussions. One Sunday evening in the drawing-room at Lambeth the conversation turned on the treatment of China and the future of the Far East. After a pause the Archbishop said very solemnly, "The longer I live, the more it is borne in upon me that we cannot modify the course of history."¹

On another evening there was a talk about the sectarian divisions of England : "What are we to do?" The Archbishop said, "I don't see that we can do much except what we are doing : we must do our work with a higher standard ; but our divisions are in God's hands." It was not that he did not care, but the older he grew, the more the spiritual vision lengthened ; the better he understood the limits of the work possible in one generation.

¹ Cf. : Before man's First, and after man's poor Last,
God operated and will operate.—*Browning*.

He was asked, "Why do you not tell people in sermons that the current view on some subjects is not the true doctrine?"

It would do more harm than good. The proper course is to preach sermons in which the true conception is presupposed, but not definitely stated; then people who think will find it out and be benefited, and those who do not think will not be uselessly disturbed. Of course if one is asked the question point-blank, one must either give no answer or else the true one.

He was always very keen for stimulating thought, and especially for more expository preaching. When one urged that the immense work of the clergy prevented their reading enough, he said:—

Then they must give up some of that work. I know the work is valuable, but our first duty is to preach the Word of God, and we can't preach it if we don't know it.

He was specially anxious that working-men should be treated as having minds:—

Don't preach down to them; they always find it out. They can follow the stiffest argument if it is expressed in plain language. But the man must know what he means himself; they won't hunt about for ideas if they are not sure that there are any.

While never commonplace, he was always simple and plain, believing that what was universal truth could always be plainly stated: the intellect was placed high, but the conscience and the will were placed higher, and love highest of all. For him the spiritual was always supreme and the most enduring. "What a blessed sight," he once said about a poor simple old woman coming to Confirmation, "to see spiritual growth when the time for mental growth has long ceased."

With this spiritual growth he had deepening fellowship of feeling as he became older, and in-

creasingly he was touched with the sympathy of a common humanity. "I would rather that my intimate friends knew me as one who thought nothing of himself in comparison with the work that he had to do than that they should think of me as a great scholar or a great saint," he said in his Enthronement speech at Canterbury.¹ "If I did not believe," were his words at a Ruridecanal Conference, "that Christ had by His Incarnation raised my whole life to an entirely higher level—to a level with His own—I hardly know how I should live at all."

But for him the higher level was most surely to be found where life was simple and brought men nearest to their fellows. It was his desire not to stand apart which mainly decided him to make a home in Canterbury. From the first it had been a principle with him that the bishop should live in his cathedral city—a citizen among citizens, a bishop in the midst of his people. His elevation to the Archbishopric only confirmed him in his resolve. It was not of himself alone that he was thinking; he thought also of the office which he held. The Primate of all England was a great officer and required an official residence; but he was a man, and he needed a home, and such a home as would most plainly show his brother men that he was one of themselves. He wanted to strike what he believed to be the right note for the Episcopate of the National Church in coming days. It was something to him also that the Archbishop should be quite close to his Cathedral, within sound of its sacred music, and able to attend its daily services. When his frequent presence at Mattins or Evensong in Canterbury Cathedral is mentioned, thoughts naturally go back to his delight in the daily service at Balliol and the sacred round

¹ "Primacy" *Memoir*, p. 259.

of the Holy Week at Oxford.¹ In his last days he "turns again home." Not long before the end he was observed to be much fatigued with the length of a Cathedral service, and a friend remonstrated with him for kneeling upright through all the prayers. "I always do that," he said; "my mother taught me." There never was a fuller life than his, nor one more true to the home training and the early ideals. They had been translated into long years of service with much drudgery in them; but 'not one thing had failed of all the good things which the Lord his God spake concerning' him.' He was very happy but humble.

To Archdeacon Sandford

FULHAM PALACE, October 24, 1896.

It is after post time and this cannot reach you till after you will have heard that I am going to Canterbury. You must give me your earnest prayers.

I thought a younger man would have (been) preferred, but as things are just now I did not think I should be doing right if (I) shrank from undertaking the work.

Ask God to give me help and guidance and a deeper and truer sense of devotion.—Your most affectionate

F. LONDON :

Two years later he writes :—

To the Same

OLD PALACE, CANTERBURY,
December 26, 1898.

I am beginning to find here something of the homeliness of Exeter nearly thirty years ago. The Cathedral people receive me kindly, and seem to like the idea of my living among them. The City people are even warmer. And my Wife and my Boys are enough to make any home happy.

This year I have come to the point at which half of my public life has been in the Episcopate. I began work as a Balliol Tutor in 1842; I began work as a Bishop in 1870, 28 years later; it is now the end of 1898, 28 years later still.

¹ *Supra*, p. 462.

How many things would I change if I had to live the 56 years over again ! and how many, very many, blessings have been given me in those years. . . .—Your most affectionate
F. CANTUAR.

His cup was “running over,” and the sense of a completed life struck all men. He was sensible himself of limitations ; but to those who preach in modern times that human life falls short on every side, it is well to point to the life of Frederick Temple, rounded off, fulfilled. Not that he was unconscious of what was missing as one by one the men of his generation¹ left his side.

“These deaths one after another,” he writes, “take away the past. *Abiit ad plures* acquires a new meaning. And the *plures* instead of being all mankind comes to mean all one’s own.”¹

He wrote this in 1893, but nearly ten years of strenuous work were still before him.

Notably

Hath he been pressed, as if his age were youth,
From to-day’s dawn till now that day departs.

At last he passed in himself amongst those who had been his friends and fellow-travellers ; but without fear, almost jubilant, steadfast to the end. “Childe Roland to the Dark Tower came,” but “dauntless” blows his horn ; the “happy warrior” is still happy while fighting his last battle ; the sheep has entered the valley of the shadow, but the Shepherd’s ‘rod and staff comfort him.’


And so he is gone. He stands out from amongst the men of his day, a notable figure, unlike others, cast in a larger mould, nobler than most, more self-reliant, more absolutely incapable of doing anything mean or of acting from self-interested motives ; he worked harder and longer ; he was more unworldly ; he grasped more firmly the

¹ Letter to Archdeacon Sandford, July 29, 1893.

substance of life; he was a greater man; but a man nevertheless, working with and for his fellows, compelling the admiration of all, but winning most love from those who knew best, the man's heart within him. To the elders who are left he is a great memory, and as they look back and realise to what extent they lived in him they fancy that life now lies behind them. But it was a real life which they shared, and it still remains; for it belonged to the eternal world, and is of those things "which cannot be moved." Even its methods will last long; they had always about them something of the enduring spirit of the man. And thus the life points onward and has a meaning for those who are young. The air of perpetual spring blows round the old man's grave: the memory speaks reality and hope, and these are the memories which live.

The Archbishop died in the presence of his wife and sons, and other members of the home. When the pulse had ceased the Archbishop's own prayer was said; it had been used daily in the family for many years:—

WE ALSO PRAISE THY HOLY NAME FOR ALL THY SERVANTS DEPARTED FROM AMONGST US IN THY FAITH AND FEAR: AND WE HUMBLY RESEECH THEE SO TO BLESS US THAT REMAIN ON EARTH, THAT, BEING PROTECTED FROM ALL EVIL, GHOSTLY AND BODILY, WE MAY EVER SERVE AND PLEASE THEE WITH QUIET MINDS AND THANKFUL HEARTS, AND TOGETHER WITH THOSE THAT ARE GONE BEFORE MAY HAVE OUR REFRESHMENT IN PARADISE AND OUR PORTION IN THE RESURRECTION OF THE JUST, THROUGH JESUS CHRIST OUR LORD. AMEN.



MEMORIAL TO ARCHBISHOP TEMPLE IN CANTERBURY CATHEDRAL

INDEX

INDEX

- Acland, Sir C. T. D., i. 132 *note*¹, 138 *note*¹, 429 *note*¹; letter from Abp. Temple on the inspection of schools, ii. 650-652
- Acland, Rev. Leopold, ii. 523
- Acland, Sir T. D. (10th Baronet), i. 36
- Acland, Sir T. D. (11th Baronet), examination of middle-class schools in the West, i. 129, 130, 131, 132, 134, 135, 136 *note*¹; 236, 237, 344, 469; ii. 540, 545, 553, 554
- Acland, Sir Thomas Dyke, Memoir and Letters of*, i. 132 *note*¹, 218 *note*⁴, 236 *note*¹, 238 *note*¹; ii. 553
- Act of Uniformity Amendment Act (1872), Speech in Convocation, ii. 160-162
- Aetion, Lord, criticism of Abp. Temple, i. 405-406
- Acton, Lord, Letters of*, i. 406 *note*¹
- Adderley, Sir C. B., *see* Norton, Lord
- Adderley, Rev. Reginald, ii. 146
- Addington, Sale of, ii. 211-212, 262-263
- Additional Curates' Society, i. 360; ii. 216
- Addresses, *see* Speeches and Addresses
- Agenda paper for Convocation, Abp. Temple on the necessity of, i. 572-573
- Aid Grant to Voluntary Schools, ii. 223; speech on, 224; 377 *et seq.*
- Aitken, Rev. Robert, i. 383
- Albert, Prince, ii. 248
- Aldenharn, Lord, ii. 165
- Alexandra, Queen, sympathy with Abp. Temple in his last illness, ii. 241-242
- Alice in Wonderland*, i. 231
- Amalgamation of city parishes (Exeter), i. 550-552, 576
- American Bishops and the Lambeth Conference (1897)—Presentation to Abp. Temple, ii. 272-273
- Andrew, T., ii. 598
- Anecdotes of Abp. Temple, ii. 704-709
- Anti-Sweating League, Abp. Temple's views on, ii. 126
- Apostolical Succession, Abp. Temple's address to first London Diocesan Conference, ii. 10-11
- Archdeacons, i. 361-363
- Arnold, Rev. C. T., i. 153, 200
- Arnold, Matthew, i. 76, 80, 134 *note*², 153; Abp. Temple unveils medallion to, 242; letter congratulating Abp. Temple on appointment to Exeter, 278-279; 297, 582, 603 *note*¹; ii. 416
- Arnold, Dr. Thomas, death of, i. 64; 152, 153, 185, 186, 215; Abp. Temple unveils a bust of, 242; 304; ii. 461, 462, 492, 590; 594, 611, 625
- Arnold, Life of Dr.*; i. 66, 157 *note*¹, 182 *note*¹, 185 *note*¹, 215 *note*²
- Arnold, Mrs., i. 7, 236
- Arnold-Forster, E. P., ii. 600
- Arnold-Forster, Miss F., ii. 178;

- Abp. Temple's tenderness to sick boys at Rugby, 601
- Ashley, Lord, i. 73
- Asquith, Rt. Hon. H. H., i. 79
- "Associate in Arts," Abp. Temple urges the adoption of the title, ii. 542
- Athanasian Creed — Speeches in Convocation, i. 558-559; letter (1852), 513
- Atlay, Bp., of Hereford, ii. 54 *note*¹
- Austin, Stanley, ii. 280
- Avebury, Lord, ii. 143, 147
- Axon, i. 4, 21, 23, 24-28, 42, 45, 63, 320
- Aylesford, Lord, i. 151 *note*¹
- Babbage, Charles, i. 82
- Baines, Edward, i. 134
- Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J., ii. 77
- Balliol College, Abp. Temple at, i. 39-93
- Bampton Lectures, i. 582; Dr. Cosmo Lang's reminiscences of, 583-584; ii. 487 *note*¹, 633 *et seq.*
- Baptism, Abp. Temple on, i. 457; ii. 47
- Baptismal Regeneration — letters from Abp. Temple to Dr. Scott, ii. 499-509
- Bardsley, Abp., ii. 15
- Barnes, Archdeacon, i. 459
- Barry, Bp., i. 373; ii. 28
- Bartholomew, Rev. C. C., i. 392
- Battishill, W. J., i. 411 *note*¹
- Bayard, Hon. Thomas F., ii. 174
- Beaconsfield, Lord, i. 393; ii. 558
- Beale, Miss, i. 142
- Benefices Act (1898), i. 424, 428 *note*²; ii. 315
- Benson, Abp., at Rugby, i. 155, 175; Abp. Temple unveils a medallion to, 242; 274; to Abp. Temple on his appointment to Exeter, 276; letter to *The Times* on Abp. Temple's appointment to Exeter, 287-288; asks Abp. Temple to disclaim responsibility for *Essays and Reviews*, 292-293; 305; 390; appointed Bishop of Truro, 399-400; consecration and enthronement, 400; 410; 414; anecdote of Abp. Temple, 514; letter of thanks for *Times* letter from Miss Temple, 516-517; 576 *note*²; welcomes Abp. Temple to the See of London, 574-575; 594; ii. 5; appreciation of Abp. Temple's preaching, 20; Kilburn Sisterhood, 43; Lincoln Judgment, 54 *note*¹; letter⁴ to Mrs. Temple, 65; 90; Dockers' Strike (1889), 149; letter to Abp. Temple, 160; on Abp. Temple and the House of Lords, 180; death of, 245; 247, 250, 258, 261, 269, 271, 305; Abp. Temple's speech to Convocation (1897), 326-327; 591; letters from Abp. Temple (1861-1868), 592-593, 600; death of Abp. Temple's mother, 604; 614, 648; Abp. Temple's memorandum to, on the north-end position, 663, 665
- Benson, Life of Edward White*, i. 159; ii. 6 *note*¹, 19 *note*¹, 43 *note*¹
- Bere, R., ii. 538 *note*¹
- Berkeley, M. J., i. 197
- Bethell, Bp., i. 510
- Bevan, F. A., ii. 186
- Bevan, Archdeacon, of Middlesex, ii. 37
- Bickersteth, Bp., ii. 112 *note*²
- Bickersteth, Rev. Cyril, ii. 146
- Billing, Bp., of Bedford, ii. 18, 28, 38
- Eird, Rev. S. W. E., i. 492 *note*¹
- Bishop of London's Fund, ii. 52-54
- Bishop's Park, Fulham, ii. 150-151
- Bishopric of Jerusalem, The*, i. 53
- Black, Rev. W. — letter from Abp. Temple on the re-marriage of a divorced person, ii. 293-294
- Blackall, Bp. Ofspring (Exeter), i. 267, 332, 509, 527
- Blackall, Dr., i. 527
- Blackmore, Rev. John, i. 28
- Blackmore, Mrs., *née* Carveth (aunt of Abp. Temple), i. 14
- Blackmore, R. D., i. 29
- Blake, Sir Francis, i. 7
- Llake, Dr. Jex, Dean of Wells,

- i. 167; recollections of Abp. Temple at Rugby, 175-177; 194; ii. 591, 627
- Blind, Abp. Temple's sympathy for the, ii. 21, 22
- Blind, Deaf and Dumb, Royal Commission on, *ibid.* 21, 22
- Blind, Gardner's Trust for the, ii. 21
- Blomfield, Sir A. W., ii. 165
- Blondy, Bp., i. 507
- Bloxam, Andrew, i. 197
- Blundell's School, Tiverton, Abp. Temple enters, i. 29; his life at, 29 *et seq.*; course of study at, 35; awarded a scholarship, 36-38; Abp. Temple's visit in 1870, 320-321; memorandum by the Headmaster, 321-322; Abp. Temple's last visit, 605; Blundell Scholarship—letter of Abp. Temple's (1838), ii. 406-407
- Blundell's Worthies*, 332
- Board Schools, Speech in House of Lords (1884), i. 576-577
- Book of Common Prayer—reference to in the Encyclical Letter (1897), ii. 274-275
- Booth, "General," ii. 128
- Boscawen, A. G., ii. 315
- Boswell, James, his friendship with Rev. W. J. Temple, i. 6, 8, 9, 10, 11
- Boulton, A., i. 32 *note*¹
- Bowstead, Mr., i. 129
- Boyd, Dean, i. 331, 524
- Bradby, Dr., to Abp. Temple on his appointment to Exeter, i. 277
- Bradford Manuscript, return of, to the United States, ii. 173-175
- Bradley, Dean, i. 155; ii. 372, 591
- Bramley, Rev. Henry, i. 344, 345
- Bramwell, Lord, ii. 117
- Brassey, Lord, ii. 143
- Bright, John, i. 76 *note*¹
- Bristol, Abp. Temple's visit to (1901), ii. 320
- Bromby, Bp., ii. 24
- Bronescombe, Bp., i. 257, 258, 311, 378, 508
- Brougham, Lord, i. 74, 133
- Brown, W. Martin, ii. 100
- Browne, Bp. Forrest, of Bristol, ii. 6 *note*², 37, 191, 254, 280, 320, 344
- Browne, Bp. Harold, of Winchester, letter to Abp. Temple on his appointment to Exeter, i. 276; *Essays and Reviews*, 281-282, 296; 410, 525; ii. 54 *note*¹, 121, 574
- Browne, T. B., i. 105 *note*¹
- Browning, Robert, i. 582
- Bruere, Bp., i. 507, 511
- Bryce, Rt. Hon. James, i. 134 *note*², 146, 278; ii. 81 *note*¹; on Abp. Temple's connexion with Secular Education, 649-650
- Buckoll, Rev. H. J., i. 238 *note*⁴
- Bull *Apostolicæ Curæ*, ii. 260, 261, 262, 388 *et seq.*
- Burch, Arthur, i. 473
- Burgon, Dean, i. 80, 281
- Burial, Law of, Speech by Abp. Temple in the House of Lords (1876), i. 579
- Burial of infidels—Letter of Abp. Temple's, i. 459
- Burnie, R. W., ii. 302
- Burns, Rt. Hon. John, M.P., ii. 143, 144, 145, 147, 148, 149
- Bush, Rev. Paul, i. 384
- Buss, Miss, i. 142
- Butler, Rev. A. G., impressions of Abp. Temple's teaching powers, i. 167, 171; recollections of Abp. Temple at Rugby, 172-175; 214; on Abp. Temple's preaching, 216, 217, 218-219; 221, 226, 311, 414; ii. 591
- Butterfield, William, i. 512
- Buxton, Sydney, M.P., account of Abp. Temple's connexion with Dockers' Strike, ii. 142-145
- Cambridge Union, Abp. Temple's speech on Temperance to, ii. 323-324
- Campbell, Rev. Lewis, on Abp. Temple's intimacy with Jowett, i. 78; ii. 642 *note*¹
- Canterbury—Abp. Temple's episcopacy, ii. 209 *et seq.*; Abp. Temple's translation to, ii. 181 *et seq.*; his reception in, ii. 209-210; Enthronement,

- 255 *et seq.* ; restoration of the Palace and Chapel, ii. 212-216, 263-264
- Canterbury Dispensary, ii. 235
- Carlyon, Edmund, and the revival of the Cornish See, i. 378, 382, 385 *note*¹, 392, 393 *note*¹, 394, 395, 399 ; reminiscence of Miss Temple, 515
- Caröe, W. D., ii. 212, 214, 264, 271
- Carpenter, Bp., of Ripon, ii. 353
- Cartwright, James S., K.C., letter from Abp. Temple, ii. 599
- Carveth, Catherine, *see* Blackmore, Mrs.
- Carveth, Dorcas, *see* Temple, Mrs. (mother of Abp. Temple)
- Carveth, Nicholas (uncle of Abp. Temple), i. 14
- Carveth, Richard (grandfather of Abp. Temple), i. 4, 13, 14, 15
- Cathedrals, Royal Commission on (1885), i. 537-547 ; Abp. Temple's memorandum, 541-547
- Cavendish, Lady Frederick, ii. 185
- Cemeteries, Consecration of (letter from Abp. Temple), i. 455
- Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. Joseph, ii. 381
- Chapter, Exeter, and Abp. Temple, i. 535 *et seq.*
- Chapter Synods, i. 353
- Charity Commissioners and Exeter Theological College, i. 411
- Chartist Movement, i. 73 ; ii. 356
- "Chivalry of Industry"—letter from Abp. Temple to Canon Lawson (1846), i. 470-471
- Choirs, Church, Abp. Temple on, ii. 51
- Christ's Hospital—Abp. Temple's sermon (1900), ii. 317
- "Christian Doctrine and Christian Life"—address at Folkestone Church Congress (1892), ii. 65-67
- "Christianity and Imperialism"—speech at the People's Palace (1901), ii. 266
- Chronicles of Convocation*, i. 413 *note*¹, 417 *note*¹, 558 *note*², 559 *note*¹, ², ³, 561 *note*¹, 562 *note*², 563 *note*¹, ², ³, 564 *note*¹, 565 *note*¹, 566 *note*¹, 568 *note*¹, ², 569 *note*¹, 570 *note*¹, 571 *note*², 573 *note*¹, 574 *note*², 575 *note*¹, ²
- Chronicles of Twyford*, by F. J. Snell, i. 553 *note*¹
- Church and Stage Guild, Abp. Temple's letter to, ii. 129-130
- Church Army and Navy Board, ii. 674-675
- Church Association Memorial on the St. Paul's reredos, Abp. Temple's reply to, ii. 113-115
- Church building and restoration in the Exeter Diocese, i. 587
- Church Congresses :—
- Bradford (1898), ii. 310-312 ; speech on the origin of the Episcopacy, 311 ; Men's Meeting, 312
- Brighton (1901), speech on the Housing of the Poor, ii. 314-315
- Exeter (1894), i. 606
- Folkestone (1892), address on Christian Doctrine and Christian Life, ii. 65-67
- London (1899), ii. 313
- Newcastle (1900), ii. 313-314 ; speech at Men's Meeting, 314
- Nottingham (1897), i. 26 ; ii. 309, 310 ; addresses to working men, i. 26 ; ii. 210 ; sermon, ii. 309-310
- Plymouth (1876), i. 606
- Shrewsbury (1896), address on Evolution, ii. 67
- Church Discipline—Abp. Temple's speech in Convocation (1884), i. 565
- Church Endowments, speeches of Abp. Temple's on, ii. 169-170, 315
- Church Extension in the Three Towns during the Exeter Episcopate, i. 492 *et seq.*
- Church Historical Society, ii. 253
- Church History, Study of : address by Abp. Temple (1892), ii. 69-70
- Church in Cornwall*, *The*, i. 401 *note*¹, ², 402 *note*¹
- Church Missionary Intelligence*, ii. 58
- Church Missionary Society, i. 587-588 ; ii. 225

- Church of England, Lawlessness in ; speech in House of Lords (1900), ii. 355-356
- Church of England Men's Society, i. 489
- Church of England Pulpit and Ecclesiastical Review*, ii. 676 *note*¹
- Church of England Temperance Society, i. 482 *et seq.* ; ii. 134 *et seq.*, 222, 238
- Church of the Fathers*, i. 53
- Church Patronage, i. 424-428, 576 ; ii. 11, 13
- Church Patronage Bill (1893) ; speech in Convocation, ii. 162
- Church, Reading in, Abp. Temple on, i. 437-438 ; ii. 49
- Church Reform, Abp. Temple on, ii. 64, 154
- Church Reform League, ii. 669
- Church Services, Abp. Temple on the conduct of, ii. 49 ; unauthorised forms of (Abp. Temple's Charge, 1895), ii. 110-111
- Church, Dean, i. 468 ; ii. 476, 485
- Churchill, Lord Edward Spencer, ii. 302
- Clarendon, Earl, i. 176, 184, 188
- Clarke, Thomas, i. 33 ; ii. 408
- Classical Education, Abp. Temple's views on, i. 168-170
- Claughton, Bp. Piers, ii. 24
- Clergy Discipline Act (1892), i. 566 ; ii. 160
- Clergy, Memorials from, on Abp. Temple's appointment to London, i. 596-598
- Clergy, Abp. Temple's personal relations with (Exeter), i. 44⁹ *et seq.*
- Clerical Study, Abp. Temple's Charge (1875), i. 438-441
- Clough, A. H., Abp. Temple's intimacy with, i. 44, 52, 53, 90, 91 ; 153, 162 *note*¹ ; Abp. Temple unveils portrait of, 242 ; 297, 416
- Cobham, Captain, correspondence with Abp. Temple on commemorating the dead, ii. 109-110 ; on the St. Paul's reredos, 114
- Colenso, Bp., ii. 613
- Coleridge, John Duke, Lord, at Oxford, i. 40, 44, 78 ; letter from Abp. Temple concerning *Essays and Reviews*, 285, 311 ; 469 ; on the St. Paul's reredos, ii. 116 ; Abp. Temple's intimacy with, 415-416 ; letters from Abp. Temple, 563 *et seq.* ; 611 *note*¹
- Coleridge, Life and Letters of Lord*, ii. 435 *note*³
- Coleridge, S. T., Abp. Temple's early admiration for, ii. 423-424, 472 ; 484, 633, 690
- Collard, Sir George, ii. 236
- Collins, Bp., of Gibraltar, ii. 254
- Combined system of education, Abp. Temple's letters to Lord Coleridge, ii. 563 *et seq.*
- Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews*, by B. Jowett, ii. 515
- Commonwealth, The*, i. 178 *note*¹
- Compton, Lord Alwyn, Bp. of Ely, ii. 327
- Compton, Rev. B., i. 153 *note*⁶
- Confession, Abp. Temple's action with regard to : correspondence with Rev. C. Benson, ii. 104-107 ; views on, 290
- Confirmations, i. 354, 355, 586 ; ii. 7, 23 ; letter from Bp. Walsingham How, 24 ; Abp. Temple's reply, 25, 26 ; 38, 47, 178, 229
- Congregational Union, ii. 119, 120
- "Conscience and the Bible"—address by Abp. Temple, ii. 91
- Consubstantiation, ii. 291
- Contagious Diseases Act, Abp. Temple's speech in the House of Lords (1897), ii. 345-346
- Convocation, i. 555 *et seq.* ; ii. 153 *et seq.* ; joint meetings of the two Provinces, ii. 329 *et seq.* ; letters to Dr. Scott (1852-1853), 518-522 ; *Essays and Reviews*, 612
- Convocation, Reform of, ii. 327 *et seq.*
- Convocation : *Speeches* :—
Act of Uniformity Amendment Act, ii. 160-162
Agenda paper, the necessity of, i. 572-573

Convocation : *Speeches (cont.)*—

Athanasian Creed, i. 558-559

Authorisation by Royal Warrant,
ii. 342

Benefices Bill, ii. 352

Benson, Abp., death of, ii. 326-
327

Church Discipline, i. 565

Church Patronage Bill, ii. 162

Convocation, Reform of, ii. 327-
328

Deacons Bill, ii. 156

Dilapidations, ii. 342

Ecclesiastical Courts, i. 559-563 ;
ii. 336

Education Bill, ii. 339-341

Episcopal Veto, i. 564

Family Prayer, Manual of, i.
569-570

Gambling, ii. 158-159

Hearing of Cases of Doubt, ii.
330-331

Holy Orders, Candidates for, ii.
341-342

Hymnal, Authorised, i. 568-569

Marriage Act Amendment Act,
ii. 157-158

Marriage with Deceased Wife's
Sister, ii. 343

Ornaments Rubric, i. 563

Parochial Councils, ii. 334

Revised Version, ii. 334-335

Rogation Days, i. 571

Salvation Army, i. 567-568

Sunday Editions of Newspapers,
ii. 335

Unauthorised Services, ii. 332-
334

Vestments, i. 563

Voluntary Schools, ii. 163, 337-
339

Conybeare, Mrs., i. 30

Conybeare, Rev. W. J., i. 19 ; ii.
384, 386

Cook, Canon, letter to, on *Essays
and Reviews*, i. 285-286 ; his
support of Abp. Temple, 289,
290, 291, 305 ; Phillpotts'
Studentships, 411, 414 ; 556,
557 *note*², 558 *note*¹ ; ii. 637

Cornish See, Revival of the :—
History of the Cornish Church,
i. 374-379 ; first efforts to
revive the Cornish Bishopric,

379-381 ; Abp. Temple's ad-
vent and work in Cornwall,
384-391 ; discussion in the
Exeter Diocesan Conference,
391-392 ; Deputation to Mr.
Disraeli, 393 ; appointment of
Diocesan Committee, 394-395 ;
Lady Rolle's gift, 395, 397,
398 ; Bill for revival of the
Cornish See, 396, 397 ; Dr.
Benson appointed first Bishop,
399-400 ; consecration and
enthronement, 400 ; Abp.
Temple's farewell to Corn-
wall, 401-402

Cornwall, History of, i. 7 *note*³

Coronation, the, ii. 236, 237, 238,
370 *et seq.*, 676

Courtenay, Peter, Bp. of Exeter,
i. 509

Coverdale, Miles, Bp. of Exeter,
i. 267

Cowie, Dean, i. 310

Cowper, Earl, ii. 77, 346

Cranbrook, Earl, ii. 353

Creighton, Bp., of London, ii. 6
*note*², 69, 103, 174, 261, 267,
268, 325, 332, 353

Crimean War, ii. 560, 577, 589

Criminal Law Amendment Act,
Abp. Temple's Pastoral Letter,
ii. 128-129

Cross, Lord, i. 397, 398

Crowfoot, Canon J. H., i. 174
*note*²

Culmstock, i. 319, 320

Cure, Canon Capel, ii. 9

Cust, Dr., ii. 39

Cuthbertson, Sir J. N., ii. 286

"

Daily News, i. 352 ; ii. 90

Davidson, Abp., i. 151 ; speech on
Clergy Discipline, ii. 107 ; on
Episcopal Veto, 112 ; 265 ; on
Abp. Temple's appointment
to London, 325 ; Abp. Temple's
death (speech), 344 ; Sunday
Bill, 346 ; Irregularities in
Public Worship, 353 ; Coro-
nation, 373, 384

Davies, Miss Emily, i. 142

Davies, Morris, memorandum on
Abp. Temple's conversion to
Total Abstinence, i. 476-477

- Deaconesses, ii. 42-43
- Deacons Bill, Abp. Temple's speech in Convocation, ii. 156
- Dead, Commemoration of the—
Abp. Temple's correspondence with Rev. R. A. Eden and Captain Cobham, ii. 108-110
- Dead, Prayers for the, ii. 291 ;
Abp. Temple in the House of Lords, ii. 356-358
- Deane, Dr., Q.C., i. 529_a
- Deceased Wife's Sister, Marriage with, speech by Abp. Temple, i. 486-489 ; speech in House of Lords, i. 581-582
- Denbigh, Lord, i. 151 *note*¹, 215
- Denison, Archdeacon, and *Essays and Reviews*, i. 281
- Denominational Education, Abp. Temple's letters to Lord Coleridge, ii. 563 *et seq.*
- Derby, Lord, i. 134, 190
- Devon, Earl, i. 191, 320, 321, 394, 395, 397, 398, 469, 598
- Devon Evening Express*, i. 485 *note*¹
- Diamond Jubilee, ii. 260, 267, 676
- Dicken, Dr., i. 24, 25
- Diocesan Associations of Church Schools, Abp. Temple on, letter to Archdeacon Sandford, ii. 672-674
- Diocesan Board of Education, ii. 223, 224
- Diocesan Church of England Temperance Society, i. 603
- Diocesan Church Reading Union, Abp. Temple's inaugural address to, ii. 43-46
- Diocesan Conferences, i. 363-374, 483 ; ii. 9, 41-42, 225
- Diocesan Education Society, ii. 223
- Diocesan Organisation (Exeter), i. 350 *et seq.* ; Chapter Synods, 353 ; Confirmations, 354-355 ; Rural Deaneries, 355-360 ; Chapter addresses, 355-356 ; co-operation of the laity, 357 ; Archdeaconries, 361 ; Conferences, 363 *et seq.* ; Sunday School Examinations, 372 ; (London), ii. 23 *et seq.*
- Diocesan Readers, ii. 38-42
- Diocesan Temperance Festival (Ramsgate), ii. 239
- Disestablishment, Abp. Temple on, ii. 662
- Dismissal Service (Lambeth Conference, 1897), ii. 275 ; Abp. Temple's sermon, 275-276, 676
- Disraeli, Rt. Hon. Benjamin, *see* Beaconsfield, Lord
- Divorced persons, re-marriage of, Abp. Temple's views on, ii. 112, 293
- Dockers' Strike (1889), Abp. Temple and, ii. 142-150
- Dockers' Strike, The Story of the*, by H. Llewellyn Smith and Vaughan Nash, ii. 149 *note*¹
- Donne, Bp., of Albany, ii. 272, 280
- Down, T. C., i. 6 *note*²
- Duloe Rectory, i. 50 ; ii. 414, 427
- Dumbleton, Rev. E. N., i. 357, 392
- Durham, Deanery of, offered to Abp. Temple, i. 235-274
- Earle, Bp., of Marlborough (Dean of Exeter), i. 394, 395, 414, 483 ; ii. 18, 27, 32, 38, 39, 43, 192
- East London Church Fund Festival, Sermon by Abp. Temple, ii. 28-30
- Ebbs Fleet, Memorial Service at (1897), ii. 269
- Ecclesiastical Courts, Abp. Temple's speeches in Convocation, i. 559-563
- Ecclesiastical Courts, Royal Commission on, i. 561, 562 *note*¹
- Ecclesiastical Polity*, i. 306 *note*¹
- Eden, Rev. R. A., ii. 108
- Edmonds, Canon W. J., Chancellor of Exeter Cathedral, i. 36 ; memorandum by, 377, 509 *note*¹, 510 *note*¹
- Education :—
Board of Education Bill, Abp. Temple in House of Lords (1893), ii. 349-351
- Classical Education, Abp. Temple's views on, i. 168-170
- Education Acts and Bills, (1870), i. 341-343 ; (1902), 607 ; (1896),

Education (*cont.*):—

- * ii. 90-91; (1890), 159-160; speech in House of Lords (1900), 351-352; Abp. Temple's last speech in House of Lords, 380-382; (1870), 644
- Elementary Education, i. 120-128, 330, 340-346, 604; ii. 82, 89
- Endowed Schools, Abp. Temple's letter to the Mayor of Exeter, i. 332-339; 339, 340
- Endowed Schools Bill, No. 2, i. 144-146
- Free Education Act, i. 604
- Girls' Schools, i. 142
- Grammar Schools, i. 142-144
- Oxford and Cambridge Local Examinations, i. 128-132; ii. 354, 540 *et seq.*; speech at Exeter (1857), 546-549
- Popular Education Commission (1860), i. 120-128
- Public Schools Act (1868), i. 184, 185; ii. 626
- Public Schools Commissions, i. 168, 176, 180 *note*¹, 184-187, 191-195, 213 *note*¹,³
- Rate Aid, ii. 659 *et seq.*
- Religious Instruction, i. 140, 342, 369-371, 604-605; ii. 86-89, 642, 659 *et seq.*
- Schools Inquiry Commission (1864), i. 133-147, 329
- Schools, Inspection of, ii. 552; letter from Abp. Temple to Sir C. T. D. Acland, 650-652
- Secondary Education, i. 137-140, 146, 330, 604, 608; ii. 81, 163, 381, 647, 648; Mr. Bryce's reminiscences of Abp. Temple, 649, 650
- Secular Education, i. 141; ii. 642
- Technical Instruction, i. 141
- Voluntary Schools, i. 345-348; speech in House of Lords, ii. 348-349; speech in Convocation on the financial condition of, 163
- Education of the World*, Abp. Temple's contribution to *Essays and Reviews*, q.v.
- Edwards, Edwin, i. 201

- Elementary Education, *see* Education
- Ellicott, Bp., of Gloucester, i. 410; ii. 112 *note*², 159
- Encyclical Letter (Lambeth Conference, 1897), ii. 273 *et seq.*, 294, 295
- Endowed Schools, *see* Education
- Endowed Schools Bill, No. 2, *see* Education
- Endowments of the Church, speech by Abp. Temple on, ii. 315
- English, F. A., ii. 213
- Episcopacy, Origin of, speech by Abp. Temple on, ii. 311
- Episcopal Veto, speech in Convocation by Abp. Temple, i. 564; ii. 112 *et seq.*
- Epistles of St. Paul to the Thessalonians, Galatians and Romans*, by B. Jowett, i. 78, 79
- Erle, Peter, i. 134
- Essays and Reviews*, i. 80, 89, 176, 219-226, 280; Dr. Pusey and, 281; Dean Mansell and, 281; Dean Burgon and, 281; Cockspur Street Committee, 281; Lord Shaftesbury and, 281; Bishop Harold Browne and, 281-282; Bishop Wilberforce and, 282-283; Sir Stafford Northcote and, 283-284; letter to Lord Coleridge from Abp. Temple, 285; to Canon Cook, 285-286; Abp. Benson's letter to *The Times*, 287-288; Professor Hort's letter to Abp. Benson, 288-289; Canon Cook's support of Abp. Temple, 289 *et seq.*; correspondence between Abp. Temple and the Bp. of Lincoln, 292-294; withdrawal of, *Essays and Reviews*, 301; Archdeacon Freeman's statement in Convocation, 301; Abp. Temple's statement in Convocation, 302-305; effect of the agitation on Abp. Temple, 305; 406, 497 *note*¹; ii. 516, 592 *note*¹; origin and history of, 604 *et seq.*; 633, 635, 636
- Essays on a Liberal Education*, i. 198

- Eucharistic doctrine, ii. 107-108, 291
- Evans, Charles, i. 155, 226; ii. 591
- Evans, T. S., i. 155, 226
- Evolution, Abp. Temple's address at Shrewsbury (1896), ii. 67-69; letter to his son, William Temple, 686-688
- Exeter, Abp. Temple presented with the Freedom of, i. 609-611
- Cathedral, memorial window to Abp. Temple in, i. 253; Edward the Confessor's Charter, 254-255; restoration of, 521 *et seq.*; Abp. Temple's sermon in aid of the Restoration Fund, 547-549
- Church Congress (1894), i. 606
- Episcopal Schools, i. 332
- Grammar School, i. 332
- Hele's Charity, i. 332
- Hospital of St. John, i. 332
- Maynard's Charity, i. 332
- Palace, history and restoration of, i. 507 *et seq.*
- See, foundation and history of, i. 253-272
- Exeter and Plymouth Gazette*, i. 318 *note*¹, 319 *note*^{1,2}, 326 *note*¹, 331 *note*¹, 341 *note*¹, 347 *note*¹, 369 *note*¹, 398 *note*¹, 399 *note*¹, 409 *note*¹, 523 *note*¹, 524 *note*³
- Exeter Cathedral, History of*, by Archdeacon Freeman, i. 254 *note*¹, 255 *note*¹, 526 *note*¹, 527 *note*¹
- Exeter College, i. 259, 523
- Exeter, History of*, i. 526
- Exeter, Lives of the Bishops of*, i. 260 *note*¹
- Exeter Mission (1875), i. 500
- Factories and Workshops Act, Abp. Temple's speech in House of Lords (1901), ii. 364
- "Faith," address by Abp. Temple, ii. 70-72
- Family Prayer, i. 442
- Family Prayer, Manual of, Abp. Temple's speeches in Convocation (1878-1879), i. 569-571
- Farrar, Dean, i. 198; ii. 258, 387
- Farrer, Lord, i. 80
- Farrer, Sir W. J., reminiscences of Abp. Temple, i. 83-86
- Faudel-Phillips, Sir J., ii. 186
- Fearon, Daniel, i. 134 *note*²
- Fellowships, Abp. Temple's recommendations to the Oxford University Commission (1850), i. 115-118.
- Finland, Abp. of, ii. 267
- First Principles*, Herbert Spencer's, i. 62
- Fitch, Sir J. G., i. 134 *note*², 330
- Fletcher, G. C., ii. 146
- Flowers, Abp. Temple's love of, ii. 533
- Football: The Rugby Union Game*, by Rev. F. Marshall, i. 208 *note*¹, 210 *note*¹
- Ford, Colonel, ii. 266
- Ford, E. A., ii. 39
- Forster, Rt. Hon. W. E., i. 134, 144, 330, 341; ii. 5, 600
- Fortescue, Earl (3rd), i. 133, 469
- Foundations at Rugby, Abp. Temple's proposals to the Public School Commissioners (1862-1864), i. 193-195
- Francis, A. L., i. 35, 38
- Franco-German War, i. 473
- Fraser, Bishop, i. 134 *note*²; ii. 140, 141
- Free Education Act, i. 604
- Freeman, Archdeacon, of Exeter, i. 254, 255 *note*¹, 263 *note*¹; letter from Abp. Temple, 286-287; relations with Abp. Temple, 361-362; 524
- Freeman, Professor E. A., i. 376
- Friendly Societies, Abp. Temple's address to (1870), i. 326-328
- Fulham, Old and New*, ii. 150
- Funeral, Abp. Temple's, ii. 385 *et seq.*
- "Gagging Act" (Chartist Movement), i. 73
- Gambling, Abp. Temple's speech in Convocation, ii. 158-159
- Gardner's Trust for the Blind, Abp. Temple's connexion with, ii. 21
- Gedge, Sydney, M.P., ii. 39
- General Assembly (Scotland), Abp. Temple's visit (1898), ii. 281 *et seq.*; speech to, 283-285

- Gibbs, H. Hucks, M.P., *see* Aldenham, Lord
- Gifford, Dr., i. 130; ii. 31
- Girls' Schools, Abp. Temple and, i. 142
- Gladstone, W. E., offers Abp. Temple the Deanery of Durham, i. 235; offers Bishopric of Exeter, 236; Abp. Temple's estimate of (1854), 273-274; offers Bishopric of London to Abp. Temple, 594-595; ii. 4, 5; Dr. Momerie's case, 118; 317; Abp. Temple on (1852-1855), 558, 559, 560, 561
- Glastonbury, visit to (Lambeth Conference, 1897), ii. 279
- Glyn, Bp., of Peterborough, ii. 344
- Golden Treasury, Abp. Temple on, ii. 568
- Goldschmidt, Madame (Jenny Lind), visit to Rugby, i. 199-200
- Goldschmidt, Otto, i. 199; memorandum *re* Abp. Temple and musical instruction at Rugby, 200-202
- Good Friday, a Rugby sermon of Abp. Temple's, i. 244-250
- Good Friday addresses in St. Paul's by Abp. Temple (1900), ii. 19
- Good Manners, by Abp. Temple, i. 490
- Gordon, General, and Abp. Temple, ii. 154
- Gore, Bp., of Worcester, ii. 51; consecration to See of Worcester, 254-255
- Gorham Controversy, ii. 499, 530
- Goss, Sir John, i. 202
- Goulburn, Dean, i. 151, 152, 153, 154, 158, 185, 242; ii. 588, 591, 625
- Goulburn, *Memoir of Dean*, i. 153 *note*⁶
- Grammar Schools, *see* Education
- Grandisson, Bp., of Exeter, i. 253, 260 *note*¹, 261-266, 269, 270, 311, 332, 377, 378, 506
- Granville, Lord, i. 133; ii. 269, 270, 586
- Granville, Rev. R., letters to, from Abp. Temple, i. 454, 456
- Green, Thomas H., i. 134 *note*²
- Gregory, Dean, ii. 184, 267
- Gregory, Miss, ii. 184
- Gregory, Rev. E. J., notes of addresses delivered by Abp. Temple, i. 433 *note*², 438 *note*¹
- Grenville Family, connexion of Temple's with, i. 12 *note*¹
- Gresham University, ii. 77; Abp. Temple's evidence before the Royal Commission, 78; letter to the Lord Mayor of London, 196-197; correspondence between Abp. Temple and Mr. C. S. Roundell, 198-204; 653
- Grey, Sir George, i. 99
- Guardian*, *The*, i. 151 *note*²; ii. 3, 38, 170, 313
- Guillemaud, A. G., i. 209
- Halford, Sir H. St. J., i. 151 *note*¹
- Halifax, Lord, ii. 311, 353
- Halsbury, Lord Chancellor, ii. 117, 361, 362
- Halsey, Rev. F., ii. 292
- Hammond, B. E., impressions of Abp. Temple's teaching powers, i. 165
- Hammond, James L., i. 134 *note*²
- Hanbury, Rt. Hon. R. W., school-boy appreciation of Abp. Temple, i. 176
- Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Sir William Vernon, and the Episcopal Veto, ii. 112; on the spread of Ritualism, 290
- Harington, Chancellor, and the restoration of Exeter Cathedral, i. 524, 527
- Harper, H. D., i. 145 *note*²
- Harrowby, Earl of, ii. 353
- Hart, H. G., reminiscences of Abp. Temple at Rugby, i. 163-165, 166
- Haweis, Rev. H. R., and Abp. Temple *re* preaching at the City Temple, ii. 119, 120
- Hawkins, Sir Christopher, i. 12
- Hayman, Dr., and the Headmastership of Rugby, i. 190; ii. 624-627
- Headlam, Rev. S. D., ii. 129
- Headmasters, Abp. Temple's plea for non-interference with (Public Schools Commission, 1862), i. 191-193

- Hebdomadal Board**, ii. 536, 543
Hegel's Logic, i. 78 *note*¹; ii. 484, 633
Hereford, visit to, ii. 320-321
Herkomer, Hubert von, ii. 177, 186
Herschell, Lord, ii. 114
Hervey, Lord Arthur, i. 525
Hessey, Archdeacon, of Middlesex, ii. 31, 166
Hingeston-Randolph, Prebendary, i. 260
Historical Essays, by Bp. Lightfoot, i. 257 *note*¹
Hoar, Senator G. F., account of interview with Abp. Temple, ii. 172-175
Hobhouse, Bp., of Nelson, Abp. Temple's friendship with, i. 74, 80
Hobhouse, Lord, ii. 346
Hockin, Rev. F., letter from Abp. Temple, i. 391 *note*¹
Holland, Canon Scott, on Abp. Temple and the London clergy, i. 177-178
Holy Communion, administration of, to a possibly unfit person, letter from Abp. Temple, i. 458; total abstainers and, ii. 291-292; use of wafer bread, 292-293; letters to Dr. Scott (1852-1853), 509-512
Holy Orders, Abp. Temple on, ii. 47; advice as to teachers being in, ii. 599. *See* Ordinations
Holy Scripture — addresses by Abp. Temple, ii. 91-99
 "Home Influence," address by Abp. Temple (1887), ii. 84-86
Home Reunion Meeting in North Devon and address by Abp. Temple (1880), i. 452-455
Home Rule, letter from Abp. Temple to Mr. Lee Warner, ii. 639-641
Hook, Dean, of Chichester, i. 134
Hornby, Provost, of Eton, reminiscences of Abp. Temple, i. 86-93
Hort, Professor F. J. A., letter to Abp. Benson on *Essays and Reviews*, i. 288-289
House of Lords, *see* Lords, House of
Housing of the Poor, Abp. Temple's speech at the Brighton Church Congress (1901), ii. 314-315
Housing of the Working Classes, Royal Commission on, ii. 153
How, Bishop Walsham, and Abp. Temple (London Episcopate), ii. 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 34, 38; correspondence as to Confirmations and the duties of a Suffragan Bishop, 24-25
How, Life of Bishop Walsham, ii. 23, 25 *note*¹
Hughes, Henry, reminiscence of Abp. Temple, i. 75
Hughes, Rev. J. B., reminiscence of Abp. Temple, ii. 601 *note*²
Hughes, Thomas, description of scene at Abp. Temple's farewell sermon at Rugby, i. 238; Abp. Temple unveils statue of, 242; 297
Hugo, Mrs., *née* Temple (sister of Abp. Temple), i. 16
Hutton, Sir John Hutton, ii. 151
Huxley, Thomas Henry, i. 51
Hymnal, authorised, Abp. Temple's speech in Convocation (1870), i. 568
Iddesleigh, Lord, Abp. Temple's friendship with, i. 80; Schools Inquiry Commission (1864), 134; letter to Abp. Temple *re Essays and Reviews*, 283-284; presentation of Pastoral Staff at Exeter, 469
Ideal of a Christian Church, by W. G. Ward, i. 44, 66; ii. 476
Illustrations of Literature, i. 9 *note*¹
Incense, Encyclical letter referring to, ii. 296 *et seq.*; Abp. Temple's reply to deputations, 302-304
Increase of the Episcopate Bill (1875), Abp. Temple and, i. 396, 576
Incumbents' Resignation Act (1871), i. 428, 429; ii. 162
Indian Civil Service, Abp. Temple appointed an examiner for, ii. 539, 562
Infidel, Burial of, letter of Abp. Temple's on, i. 459

- Ingram, Bp. Winnington, appreciation of Abp. Temple's Quiet Day address, ii. 20-21; reminiscence of Abp. Temple, 193; Marriage with Deceased Wife's Sister Bill, 343; speaks in Convocation on the death of Abp. Temple, 344; 384
- Ingram, Rev. E. H. Winnington, i. 218 *note*⁵
- Inscription on Memorial Tablet, letter from Abp. Temple, i. 455
- Inspection of Schools, *see* Education
- Ionian Islands, Abp. Temple's childhood in, i. 16-22
- Ireland Scholarship, Abp. Temple tries for, i. 425, 427, 428
- Irish Church, Disestablishment of, Abp. Temple and, i. 274; ii. 356
- Irish University Bill (1873), letter from Abp. Temple to Mr. Lee Warner, ii. 639
- Jackson, Bp., of London, i. 295, 594; death and episcopate of, ii. 3 *et seq.*, 31, 150
- James, Dr., i. 195 *note*², 241, 242
- James, Mrs., i. 13, 14
- Jebb, Sir Richard, ii. 362
- Jelf, Professor, i. 63; ii. 414; letter to Abp. Temple's mother, 468
- Jenkin, James, i. 74, 75
- Jenkyns, Dr., i. 37, 48, 49, 63, 89; ii. 413
- Jeune, Dr., i. 130; ii. 543
- "John o' London," ii. 6 *note*³
- Johnstone, Rev. Murdoch, ii. 37
- Joint examination of Board Schools in religious knowledge, Abp. Temple on, i. 456
- Jowett, Benjamin, recollections of Abp. Temple at Oxford, i. 40-45; 48; friendship with Abp. Temple, 77, 78, 79; 109, 113, 223, 581, 582; ii. 414, 426, 484, 492, 514, 515, 594, 641; 668 *note*¹
- Jowett, *Life of Benjamin*, ii. 654 *note*¹
- Joyce, Rev. F. H., ii. 8; reminiscences of Abp. Temple, 35
- Kant, Abp. Temple and, i. 78 *note*¹, ii. 633
- Keating, Mr. Justice, i. 529
- Kemble, John H., i. 51, 55, 56, 64
- Kempe, Prebendary, on Abp. Temple's appointment to the Primacy, ii. 181
- Kendal, John, i. 527
- Kennaway, Sir John, i. 588
- Kennion, Bp., of Bath and Wells, ii. 344
- Kensit, John, ii. 311, 332, 333
- Keppell, Bishop, i. 7, 509
- Kilburn Sisterhood, ii. 43
- Kimberley, Earl, ii. 353, 366
- King's College, Abp. Temple and, ii. 73, 76, 78
- King's School, Canterbury, Abp. Temple and, ii. 233-255; address on "Work," 234-235; address on "Holidays," 235
- Kinloch, Adrian, ii. 289
- Kinloch, Alasdair, ii. 289
- Kinnaird, Lord, ii. 353, 356
- Kitchener, F. E., ii. 591
- Kneller Hall, i. 76; founding of, 98-100; Abp. Temple's work at, 101 *et seq.*; ii. 563 *et seq.*
- Lach-Szyrma, Rev. W. S., i. 379 *note*², 380
- Ladies' Diocesan, ii. 185
- Laity, Representation of, ii. 666 *et seq.*
- Lake, Dean, of Durham, i. 78, 80, 113, 152; sermon at Abp. Temple's consecration to the See of Exeter, 297-298
- Lambeth Conference (1897), ii. 260, 268 *et seq.*, 676
- Lambeth Palace, Abp. Temple's expenditure on, ii. 264; transfer of playing field to London County Council, 265
- Lang, Dr. Cosmo (Bishop of Stepney), reminiscences of Abp. Temple's Bampton Lectures, i. 583-584
- Lansdowne, Lord (4th Marquis), i. 99; ii. 586
- Lascelles, Beatrice Blanche, *see* Temple, Mrs. (wife of Abp. Temple)
- Lascelles, Lady Caroline, i. 513, 519

- Lascelles, Sir Frank, ii. 125, 178
 Lascelles, Hon. Mary Louisa, i. 513
 Lascelles, Rt. Hon. William Sebright, i. 519
 Lavington, Bp., of Exeter, i. 268, 383, 509
 Lawlessness in the Church of England, Abp. Temple's speech in the House of Lords, ii. 355-356
 Lawson, Canon Robert, Abp. Temple's friendship with, i. 34, 77, 320, 493; letters to, 67, 71, 220, 470-471; ii. 523 *et seq.*, 555, 575, 580, 601, 611, 617
 Lawson, Miss C. F., i. 18 *note*³; recollections of Abp. Temple's schooldays, 33
 Lawson, Mrs., recollections of Abp. Temple, i. 37-38
 Lay Readers, i. 503; ii. 38-42
 Lee Warner, H., reminiscences of Abp. Temple, i. 18 *note*¹, 63, 101 *note*², 157-159, 160-162, 210, 218 *note*¹, 219 *note*³, 230, 241 *note*¹; letters to, from Abp. Temple, ii. 639, 666, 667
 Lefroy, Dean, of Norwich, ii. 321
 Leigh, Dean, of Hereford, ii. 321
 Leigh, Lord, i. 151 *note*¹
 Leishman, Dr., ii. 281, 282
 Leo XIII., Pope, ii. 261
 Leofric, Bp., of Exeter, i. 253, 254, 255, 374
Letters of James Boswell to the Rev. W. J. Temple, i. 8
 Leven and Melville, Earl, ii. 282
 Lewis, Bp., of Llandaff, ii. 344
 Lewis, Bp., of Ontario, ii. 268
 Licensing Bill (1902), Abp. Temple's speech in House of Lords, ii. 361
 Licensing Laws, Royal Commission on, ii. 358
 Liddell, Dean, ii. 270
 Liddon, Canon, ii. 50
 Lightfoot, Bp., of Durham, i. 261; on Abp. Temple's action respecting *Essays and Reviews*, 305, 594; ii. 250
 Lincoln Judgment, ii. 54-57
 Lind, Jenny, *see* Goldschmidt, Madame
 Lingen, Lord, i. 76, 80, 98, 107, 113, 152 *note*¹, 291; ii. 484, 586
 Liquor Licensing Laws, Royal Commission on, speech by Abp. Temple in House of Lords, ii. 358-359
 Lisburn, Lord, i. 7
 Lloyd, Rev. Thomas, ii. 317
 Local Government Bill, ii. 162
 "Log of the Mayflower," *see* Bradford Manuscript
 London, offer of See of, to Abp. Temple, i. 594-596; ii. 4-6; Abp. Temple's official signature as Bishop of, 6; Abp. Temple's episcopate, 3 *et seq.*
 London, University of, ii. 73 *et seq.*; Abp. Temple's evidence before the Royal Commission, 74-77
 London Diocesan Conference, speech by Abp. Temple (1892), i. 26
 Longley, Abp., ii. 269
 Lonsdale, T. C., i. 78
 Lopes, Lord Justice, ii. 116
 Lords, House of, Abp. Temple's position in, ii. 176
 Lords, House of, *Speeches*—
 Benefices Bill (1898), ii. 352-353
 Board of Education Bill (1899), ii. 349-351
 Board Schools (1884), i. 576-577
 Burial, Law of (1876), i. 579
 Burial Grounds Bill (1900), ii. 362
 Contagious Diseases (1897), ii. 345-346
 Education Bill (1900), ii. 351-352; Abp. Temple's last speech (1902), 380-383
 Factory and Workshops Act (1901), ii. 364
 Lawlessness in the Church of England (1900), ii. 355-356
 Licensing Bill (1902), ii. 361
 Liquor Licensing Laws, Royal Commission on (1900), ii. 358-359
 Marriage Act Amendment Act (1900), ii. 362

- Lords, House of, *Speeches (cont.)***—
 Marriage with Deceased Wife's Sister, i. 580-581
 Prayers for the Dead (1900), ii. 356-358
 Public Houses (Scotland) Bill (1902), ii. 361
 Public Worship, Irregularities in (1899), ii. 353-355
 Queen Victoria, Death of (1901), ii. 366-367
 Royal Declaration Bill (1901), ii. 362
 Sale of Intoxicating Liquors to Children Bill (1901), ii. 360
 Suffragan Bishops Bill (1898), ii. 347-348
 Sunday Bill (1897), ii. 346-347
 University Test Bill, i. 578-579
 Voluntary Schools Bill (1897), ii. 348-349
- Lowe, Robert (Viscount Sherbrooke)**, i. 352
- Lubbock, Sir John**, *see* Avebury, Lord
- Lusk, Sir Andrew**, ii. 143
- Lyall, Sir James**, ii. 212
- Lyttelton, Canon**, and *Essays and Reviews*, ii. 617
- Lyttelton, Lord**, and Schools Inquiry Commission (1864), i. 133, 134, 135, 136 *note*¹, 176; Increase of the Episcopate Bill, 396, 576
- Macarthur, Bp., of Bombay**, ii. 312
- Macaulay, Lord**, i. 109
- Mackarness, Bp., of Oxford**, i. 525
- MacLagan, Abp.**, ii. 261, 384, 387, 647
- Macmillan, Alexander**, suggests publication of *Rugby Sermons*, ii. 614 *note*¹
- Maidstone, Abp. Temple's visit to**, in the typhoid year (1897), ii. 230-231
- Malins, Vice-Chancellor**, and Dr. Hayman's case, ii. 626
- Management Clauses** (1846), ii. 565, 569, 573
- Manisty, Sir Henry (Mr. Justice)**, ii. 116
- Manning, Cardinal**, and the Dockers' Strike (1889), ii. 143, 144, 145, 147, 148, 149
- Mansell, Dean**, and *Essays and Reviews*, i. 281
- Marriage**, Abp. Temple's, i. 519 *et seq.*
- Marriage**, sanctity of, dealt with in Encyclical Letter, ii. 273-274
- Marriage of unbaptized persons**, letter from Abp. Temple, i. 458
- Marriage Act Amendment Act**, speech by Abp. Temple in Convocation (1889), ii. 157-158; speech in House of Lords (1900), 362
- Marshall, Rev. F.**, i. 208 *note*¹; 210 *note*¹
- Martin, Rev. R.**, i. 354; notes of a Quiet Day address delivered by Abp. Temple, 447 *note*¹
- Martineau, Dr.**, i. 79
- Mason, Canon**, ii. 14; account of Abp. Temple's connexion with the Dockers' Strike (1889), 146-149; 386
- Maurice, Frederick Denison**, ii. 118, 449
- Mayor, Robert B.**, i. 155, 187
- Metcalf, Rev. James**, i. 494 *note*¹
- Meteor, The**, i. 211, 212 *note*¹, 218 *note*³
- Milman, Dean, of St. Paul's**, i. 304
- Missions**, i. 500 *et seq.*
 Exeter Mission (1875), i. 500
 Plymouth Mission (1877), i. 500
- Missions, Foreign**, Abp. Temple's enthusiasm for, at Oxford, i. 54-55; address by Abp. Temple (1895), ii. 59; 225; speech at Sevenoaks (1891), 225-228; Abp. Temple's last sermon, 240, 276
- Mitchell, Sir Andrew**, i. 9 *note*¹
- Moberly, Bp., of Salisbury**, i. 525
- Moberly, C. E.**, i. 78, 81
- Moberly, Miss**, ii. 321
- Moberly, Mrs., née Temple** (sister of Abp. Temple), i. 16, 21, 23, 24, 81; letters to, from Abp. Temple, ii. 411, 412, 417, 418, 419, 422, 424, 445, 448, 449, 452, 455, 460, 489, 656
- Moberly, W. O.**, i. 217 *note*¹; 231
- Momerie, Dr.**, Abp. Temple and, ii. 117-118
- Monckton, L.**, ii. 230

- Monkswell, Lord, ii. 266
 "Morality and Religion," address
 by Abp. Temple, ii. 82-84
 Morcom, Rev. W. G., memorandum
 on Abp. Temple's Temperance
 work at Exeter, i. 482, 483, 484
Morning Post, on Abp. Temple's
 translation to Canterbury, ii.
 182
 Moseley, Canon Henry, reports on
 Kneller Hall, i. 101, 105 *note*¹,
 108 *note*¹
 Moulton, J. Fletcher, i. 62
 Mozley, Rev. Thomas, i. 52, 57
 Museums, Sunday opening of,
 Abp. Temple on, ii. 163
 Music, letter to W. Temple (son),
 ii. 681
Musical Age, i. 202
 Musical Instruction at Rugby,
 Memorandum by Mr. Otto
 Goldschmidt, i. 200-202
- Napier, Sir Charles, ii. 558
 Nash, Rev. W. Frazer, ii. 24
National Education, Essay by Abp.
 Temple (1856), i. 120
 National Society, i. 73, 76, 571
*note*¹; ii. 648
 National Temperance League, i.
 484, 603
 Neligan, Bp., of Auckland, remin-
 iscences of Abp. Temple, ii.
 645-646
 Nelson, Lord (3rd Earl), ii. 43
New Age, The, by Matthew Arnold,
 i. 603 *note*¹
 New Century Fund, speech in
 support of, ii. 321
New Quarterly Magazine, i. 205
New Rugby Magazine, i. 211
 Newcastle, Duke (6th) of, i. 120
 Newcastle, Duke (7th) of, ii. 302
 Newman, Cardinal, i. 51, 53, 55,
 56, 55, 66, 91; ii. 50, 441,
 444, 445, 446, 462, 472, 485
 Nightingale, Joseph Gascoyne, i.
 7 *note*¹
 Nonconformists, relations with, i.
 451-455; ii. 119 *et seq.*
 Northcote, Sir Stafford, *see* Iddes-
 leigh, Lord
 North-end position, Abp. Temple
 and, ii. 58, 663-665
- Norton, Lord, i. 151 *note*¹
 Norwich, Abp. Temple's visit
 (1901), ii. 321
Notes and Queries, i. 6 *note*³, 8 *note*²
- Oakeley, E. M., letters from Abp.
 Temple, ii. 498-499, 657
 Oakeley, Frederick, i. 51
 Oakeley, Sir Herbert, i. 240
 O'Brien, Lady, i. 112
Old English History, by E. A.
 Freeman, i. 377
 Orders, Validity of (Papal Bull),
 ii. 260, 261, 262, 388 *et seq.*
 Ordinations—sermon at Truro
 (1871), i. 385-389; sermon at
 first Ordination (Exeter, 1870),
 407-409; examination of can-
 didates, 413-416; ii. 37, 38;
 candidates, reminiscences of,
 417 *et seq.*; 585; first ordina-
 tion at Canterbury, ii. 260
 Ornaments Rubric, speech by Abp.
 Temple in Convocation (1879),
 i. 563; Encyclical Letter, ii:
 296 *et seq.*
 "Our Social Manners and Cus-
 toms," address by Abp. Temple
 to the Church of England
 Temperance Society (1893), ii.
 141-142
 Owen, Rev. Donald M., i. 36
 Oxford, Abp. Temple as an under-
 graduate, i. 39 *et seq.*; letters
 from, ii. 408-487
 Oxford and Cambridge Local Ex-
 aminations, *see* Education
*Oxford Associate in Arts Examina-
 tion, Account of the Origin and
 Objects of*, by Sir Thomas Ac-
 land, i. 130; ii. 545 *note*¹, 549
*note*¹, 550 *note*²
 Oxford Diocesan Board of Educa-
 tion, i. 74
Oxford Essays (1856), i. 120
 Oxford Movement, i. 41-43, 48, 51,
 55, 56, 589; ii. 434 *et seq.*, 446
Oxford Movement, by Dean Church,
 ii. 476 *note*¹, 478 *note*²,
 485 *note*²
 Oxford University Commission
 (1850), i. 145
- Packington, Sir J., i. 122 *note*¹

- Palgrave, Francis Turner, i. 44, 76, 77; letters to, from Abp. Temple, ii. 568, 569, 578, 584 *note*¹, 662
- Pall Mall Gazette*, i. 238; ii. 128
- Palmer, Edwin, i. 44
- Palmerston, Lord, connexion with the Temple family, i. 12 *note*¹; 133; ii. 558, 561, 579
- Parker, Dr., ii. 119, 120
- Parochial Councils, Abp. Temple on (Visitation Charge, 1884), i. 503-504
- Party Politics, relations of the clergy to, speech by Abp. Temple (1895), ii. 131-133
- Pascal and other Sermons*, by Dean Church, i. 463
- Pascoe, Rev. R. C., i. 410
- Pastoral Aid Society, i. 360
- Pastoral Letters, Abp. Temple's, i. 360; Church Patronage, 428; Criminal Law Amendment Act, ii. 128-129
- Pastoral Staff, Presentation of, to Abp. Temple at Exeter, i. 467-469; London, ii. 165-167
- Paton, Dr. James, ii. 281, 283, 288
- Patronage, *see* Church Patronage
- Pattison, John Coleridge, Bp. of Melanesia, i. 524
- Pearce, Edward, i. 30; ii. 406
- Penny, W., i. 159
- Penrose, Rev. John, i. 7
- People's Palace, visit of Abp. Temple to, ii. 266
- Percival, Bp., of Hereford, reminiscences of Abp. Temple's Headmastership of Rugby, i. 221-225; 226, 414; ii. 344, 627
- Pereira, Bp., of Croydon, on Abp. Temple as a leader, ii. 222, 223
- Pettersson, Anders, i. 201
- Phillimore, Mr. Justice, and the Exeter Reredos Case, i. 529
- Phillpotts, Archdeacon, i. 318, 384, 528
- Phillpotts, Bp., of Exeter, i. 270-271, 291, 307, 308, 309, 312, 344, 353, 378, 380, 385, 410-411, 492, 510, 512, 535
- Phillpotts, W. F., i. 529
- Phillpotts Studentships, i. 410-414
- Philpott, Bp., of Worcester, i. 296
- Pigot, Rev. J. T., memorandum of a Quiet Day address of Abp. Temple's, i. 443; reminiscences of Abp. Temple, 357-359
- Playfair, Lord, i. 141
- Pluralities Act Amendment Act, i. 428, 429, 566, 576
- Plymouth, Abp. Temple's speech at the Art and Science Schools (1870), i. 324-326; Abp. Temple's work at—memorandum by Mr. John Shelly, 496-499
- Plymouth, Church Extension in, i. 492 *et seq.*
- Plymouth Church Congress (1876), i. 606
- Plymouth Mission (1877), i. 500
- Political views, Abp. Temple's, *ii.* 555 *et seq.*
- Polygamy amongst the Heathen, Abp. Temple on, ii. 154
- Ponting, Rev. T. J., memorandum on Abp. Temple's Quiet Day addresses, i. 448; 552 *note*¹
- Poor, Housing of the, Abp. Temple's speech at the Brighton Church Congress (1901), ii. 314-315
- Poor in London, Relation of the Church to—address by Abp. Temple, ii. 52
- Poor Relief, Abp. Temple on, ii. 127
- Popular Education Commission (1860), i. 120-128
- Porter, Sir A. de B., ii. 342
- Portsmouth, Earl of, ii. 353, 355
- Potts, A. W., i. 230; ii. 591
- Powlett, Rev. C. J., i. 3 *note*¹, 7, 8
- Powlett, Mrs., *née* Temple (aunt of Abp. Temple), i. 4 *note*², 7, 8
- Pownall, Rev. G., ii. 246
- Prayers for the Dead, Abp. Temple's speech in House of Lords, ii. 356-358
- Preaching, Abp. Temple on, i. 431-433; ii. 50-51; Visitation Charge, 434-437
- Preaching, Character of Abp. Temple's, ii. 19
- Preceptors, College of, i. 130 *note*²
- Prichard, Constantine, i. 44, 80
- Primacy, offer of, to Abp. Temple, ii. 181, 245, 246

- Processional lights, Encyclical Letter on, ii. 301 *et seq.*
- Prosecutions, Ecclesiastical, Abp. Temple on, ii. 100-101
- Protest against Abp. Temple's Confirmation as Archbishop, ii. 263
- Public Houses (Scotland) Bill, Speech by Abp. Temple in the House of Lords (1902), ii. 361
- Public Schools Act (1868), i. 184, 185; ii. 626
- Public Schools Commission (1861), i. 176, 180 *note*¹, 184-187; Abp. Temple's plea for non-interference with Headmasters, 191-193; 213 *note*^{1,3}
- Public Worship, Irregularities in, Abp. Temple in the House of Lords (1899), ii. 353-355
- Public Worship Regulation Act, i. 528
- Puleston, Sir John, ii. 168
- Purity, Social, Abp. Temple and, i. 485; ii. 273
- Purnell-Edwards, Rev. D., i. 25
- Pusey, Dr., i. 42, 51, 55, 56, 65; and *Essays and Reviews*, 281; ii. 442, 444, 446
- Pym, Bp., of Mauritius, ii. 312
- Queen Anne's Bounty, Abp. Temple's report to Convocation (1887), ii. 154-156
- Quiet Days for the Clergy, i. 430, 442 *et seq.*, 443-447; ii. 21, 269
- Quivil, Bp., of Exeter, i. 257, 258, 508
- Ramsay, Rev. J. H., i. 194 *note*²
- Rate Aid, Abp. Temple's views on, ii. 90, 659
- Reading in Church, Abp. Temple on, i. 437-438
- Real Presence, Abp. Temple on doctrine of, ii. 291
- Rechabites, Independent Order of, Abp. Temple's connexion with, i. 484, 485, 603
- Relations between Religion and Science*, Abp. Temple's Bampton Lectures, *q.v.*
- Religious Endowments, Abp. Temple on, ii. 204-205
- Religious Equality, Abp. Temple's address to his first London Diocesan Conference (1886), ii. 9-10
- Religious Instruction, *see* Education
- Remains of Hurrell Froude*, The, i. 51
- Reredos in Exeter Cathedral, i. 526 *et seq.*; account of the Exeter reredos case, 528-533
- Reredos in St. Paul's, ii. 112 *et seq.*
- Rescue work, Abp. Temple and, ii. 131
- Reservation of the Sacrament, Abp. Temple on, i. 304 *et seq.*
- Responsio* to the Bull *Apostolicæ Curæ*, ii. 261-262, 388 *et seq.*
- Rhoades, James, ode by, on Abp. Temple's leaving Rugby, i. 240-241
- Richards, H. C., ii. 120
- Richey, Rev. J., i. 28
- Richmond, D. C., i. 134 *note*²
- Riddell, James, i. 44
- Ridding, Bp., of Southwell, Abp. Temple's friendship with, ii. 309; 344
- Ritual, Abp. Temple on Church, ii. 54-58
- Ritualism, Abp. Temple's action with regard to, i. 588-592; ii. 100 *et seq.*, 290 *et seq.*
- Roberts, Lord, ii. 235, 675
- Robertson, Bp., of Exeter, ii. 344
- Robertson, James, poem on Abp. Temple's leaving Rugby, i. 237
- Roby, H. J., i. 158 *note*¹; ii. 493
- Rodd, Francis, i. 382
- Rogation Days, Abp. Temple's speech in Convocation (1879), i. 571
- Rogers, Rev. J. Guinness, ii. 119
- Rogers, Canon Saltren, i. 383, 384; letter to, from Abp. Temple, 465; 520
- Rogers, W., i. 80
- Rolle, Lady, gift to the See of Cornwall, i. 395, 397, 398, 524
- Roman Catholic, Admission of a, into the Church of England—letter from Abp. Temple, i. 456
- Rorison, Dean, of St. Andrews, ii. 289

- Rosebery, Lord, ii. 21, 359, 363
- Ross, Bp., of Exeter, i. 269, 509
- Roundell, C. S., recollections of Abp. Temple at Oxford, i. 82; ii. 78 *note*¹; letter from Abp. Temple on the Gresham University scheme, 200-204, 653 *note*²
- Royal Declaration Bill, Abp. Temple's speech in House of Lords (1901), ii. 362-363
- Rugby, Abp. Temple's Headmastership of, i. 151-250; ii. 484, 584 *et seq.*, 588 *et seq.*
- Rugby Sermons, by Abp. Temple, i. 221, 238 *note*⁶, 593; ii. 614, 633, 670 *note*²
- Rundle, Rev. T. S., i. 6 *note*¹; notes of a Quiet Day address delivered by Abp. Temple, 447 *note*¹
- Rural Deaneries, Abp. Temple and, i. 355-360, 430 *et seq.*; ii. 8, 38, 47, 52 *
- Russell, Lord John, i. 74, 82; letter to Abp. Temple on his appointment to Exeter, 279; 379; ii. 558, 586
- Russell, Rev. John, i. 313, 314
- Ryder, Admiral, i. 485
- Sadler, Professor, i. 340 *note*²
- St. Asaph, Abp. Temple's visit to, ii. 317
- St. Gabriel's Training College, address by Abp. Temple, ii. 318-319
- St. Gluvias, i. 3, 7, 12, 318
- St. Paul's Epistles, letters on, from Abp. Temple to Dr. Scott, ii. 494
- St. Paul's Reredos Case, ii. 112 *et seq.*; Abp. Temple's reply to Church Association Memorial, 113-115
- Sale of Intoxicating Liquors to Children Bill, Abp. Temple's speech in House of Lords (1901), ii. 361
- Salisbury, Lord, ii. 90, 181; letter offering the Primacy to Abp. Temple, 245; 288, 358, 359, 360, 363, 366
- Salvation Army, Abp. Temple on (Convocation, 1883), i. 567-568
- Sanders, Archdeacon, of Exeter, i. 30, 31, 38, 289, 298, 299; 320, 371, 414; ii. 407
- Sandford, Lord, i. 113; ii. 586
- Sandford, Venerable Ernest Grey, Archdeacon of Exeter, on Abp. Temple as a teacher, i. 167-168; 207-218 *note*², 311, 384, 518; ii. 27, 28; letter from Dr. Neligan, Bishop of Auckland, to, 645-646; letter from Rt. Hon. James Bryce to, 649; an Incumbent's reminiscence of Abp. Temple, 655; letters to, from Abp. Temple, i. 448, 460, 461, 462, 464, 531; ii. 27, 28, 661, 672-674, 740, 744
- Sandford, Venerable John, Archdeacon of Coventry, i. 568
- Santa Maura, i. 3, 4, 14, 17
- Scepticism, Abp. Temple on, ii. 60
- Schools Inquiry Commission, *see* Education
- School letters, Abp. Temple's, ii. 402-408
- Scotland, Abp. Temple's official visits to, ii. 281 *et seq.*
- Scott, Edward Ashley, reminiscence of Abp. Temple at Rugby, i. 178, 179; 219, 227 *note*¹
- Scott, Sir Gilbert, i. 523, 526, 527
- Scott, Lord John, i. 151 *note*¹
- Scott, Dr. Robert, Dean of Rochester, letter to Lord Selborne re Abp. Temple, i. 46-47; Abp. Temple's intimacy with, 50, 80, 113, 581, 427, 131, 230, 404; ii. 414, 415
- Letters to, from Abp. Temple, i. 118, 556; ii. 433, 478-480, 483, 493, 494, 499-512, 514-522, 534, 536, 538-558, 559, 560, 577, 579, 580, 582, 584, 593, 603, 611, 614, 615, 616, 617, 619, 620, 622, 623, 624, 631
- Seamen, Missions for, Abp. Temple and, i. 474
- Secondary Education, *see* Education
- Secular Instruction, *see* Education

- Selborne, Lord, i. 46-47; ii. 73
 "Self-Sanctification," Quiet Day
 address by Abp. Temple
 (1878), i. 443-447
 Selwyn, Bishop, ii. 461
 Semper Fidelis Society, i. 489
 Shaftesbury, Earl, and *Essays and
 Reviews*, i. 281
 Shairp, Professor J. C., i. 44, 45,
 80, 153, 175
 Sheepshanks, Bp., of Norwich, ii.
 321
 Sheffield Royal Grammar School,
 Abp. Temple's speech at Prize
 Distribution, ii. 319-320
 Shelly, John, i. 492 *note*¹; memo-
 randum on Abp. Temple's
 work at Plymouth, 495-496
 606; ii. 638 *note*²
 Shuttleworth, Sir James Kay, i.
 75, 76, 98, 99, 104, 121
 Sidgwick, Arthur, i. 183; article
 on Rugby, 205-206
 Signature, Abp. Temple's official,
 as Bishop of London, ii. 6
Simon Mephram, Life of, i. 265 *note*¹
 Sinclair, Archdeacon, of London,
 appointment to the Arch-
 deaconry, ii. 31; 43
 Sion College, ii. 7, 166
 Smith, Sir A. L., ii. 125
 Smith, Rev. F. H. Bowden, Memo-
 randum of Abp. Temple's
 speech to the Sixth Form at
 Rugby on *Essays and Reviews*,
 i. 220 *note*³
 Smith, Rev. Percy, i. 518 *note*¹
 Smith, P. Bowden, i. 187
 Smith, Chancellor P. V., ii. 40
 Smith, Rt. Hon. W. H., ii. 42, 77
 Snell, F. J., i. 553 *note*¹
 Social Questions, Abp. Temple's
 interest in, i. 471 *et seq.*; ii.
 123 *et seq.*
 Social Science Association Meet-
 ing (1863), i. 333
 Society for the Promotion of Chris-
 tian Knowledge, i. 73
 Society for the Propagation of the
 Gospel, ii. 225, 320
 South African War, ii. 674
 Speeches and Addresses:—
 Art and Science Schools, Ply-
 mouth (1870), i. 324-326
 Speeches and Addresses (*cont.*):—
 Canterbury, Guildhall meeting,
 ii. 185; on day of Enthrone-
 ment, 259-260
 "Christian Doctrine and Chris-
 tian Life" (Folkestone, 1892),
 ii. 65-67
 "Christianity and Imperialism"
 (People's Palace, 1902), ii.
 266
 Church History, Study of (1892),
 ii. 69-70
 Church Reform (1896), ii. 64
 Diocesan Church Reading Union
 —Inaugural address, ii. 43-
 46
 Diocesan Conference, First
 (Exeter), i. 366-369
 Diocesan Readers (1891), ii. 41-42
 East London Church Fund
 Festival (1888), ii. 28-30
 Education (West Buckland,
 1870), i. 331
 Endowments of the Church, ii.
 315
 Episcopacy, Origin of the (Brad-
 ford, 1898), ii. 311
 Evolution (Shrewsbury, 1896),
 ii. 67, 69
 Exeter Cathedral, Restoration
 of, i. 523, 524
 "Faith," ii. 70-72
 Friendly Societies (1870), i. 326-
 328
 General Assembly, Scotland
 (1898), ii. 283-285
 "Holidays" (King's School), ii.
 235
 Holy Scripture, ii. 91-99
 Home Influence (1887); ii. 84-86
 Home Reunion, i. 452-455
 Housing of the Poor (Brighton,
 1901), ii. 314-315
 Morality and Religion, ii. 82-84
 Nottingham Church Congress
 (1897), ii. 309-310
 "Our Social Manners and
 Customs" (C.E.T.S. 1893), ii.
 141-142
 Oxford and Cambridge Local
 Examinations (1857), ii. 546-
 549
 Party Politics, Relation of the
 Clergy to (1895), ii. 131-133

Speeches and Addresses (*cont.*):—

- Pastoral Staff, Presentation of (London), ii. 166-167
 Poor in London, Relation of the Church to, ii. 52
 Poor Relief, ii. 127
 Presentation, on leaving Exeter, reply to, i. 599
 Quiet Days for the Clergy, i. 443-447
 Religious Equality (1886), ii. 9-10
 Reredos in St. Paul's—reply to Church Association Memorial, ii. 113-115
 St. Gabriel's Training College, ii. 318-319
 Scepticism, ii. 60
 Sheffield Royal Grammar School, ii. 319-320
 Sunday Observance, ii. 60-63
 Temperance (Cambridge Union), ii. 322-323; (Exeter Hall, 1885), ii. 133-141
 Threefold Option Alliance (Scotland, 1898), ii. 286-287
 "Work" (King's School), ii. 234-235
 Working Men's Meeting (Nottingham, 1897), ii. 310. *See* Convocation and House of Lords
 Spencer, Herbert, i. 62; ii. 633
 Spencer, Lord, letter to, from Abp. Temple, ii. 354; 381
 Spooner, Archdeacon, account of Abp. Temple's funeral, ii. 385 *et seq.*
 Spottiswoode, G. A., ii. 39
 Spottiswoode, W., i. 44
 Stafford, Bp., of Exeter, i. 255 *note*³
 Stamford, Earl, ii. 39
 Stanley, Dean, i. 76, 80, 113, 153, 158, 230, 237; letter to Abp. Temple on appointment to Exeter, 277; 297; ii. 416, 514, 606
 Stanley, Lord, i. 133
 Stapeldon, Bp., of Exeter, i. 255, 257, 259, 260, 311, 330, 332, 378, 506, 508, 525
 State aid, Abp. Temple's views on, ii. 90
 Statham, Rev. G. H., i. 29

- Stephen, Sir James, i. 91 *note*¹
 Stewart, Sir Mark, ii. 287
 Stock, Eugene, ii. 40
 Stocker, John, i. 516
 Stone, Major, i. 8
 Storrar, Dr., i. 134
 Stow, Anne, *see* Temple, Mrs. W. J.
 Stow, Fenwick, i. 7, 9
 Stow, William, i. 7
 Stubbs, Bp., of Oxford, i. 375 *note*¹; ii. 54 *note*¹, 160, 261, 327, 328
 Students' Aid Society, suggested by Abp. Temple (1866), i. 118-119; ii. 536
 Study, Clerical—Abp. Temple's Visitation Charge (1875), i. 438-441
 Suffragan Bishops Bill, Abp. Temple's speech in House of Lords (1898), ii. 347-348
 Sunday Bill, Abp. Temple's speech in House of Lords, ii. 346-347
 Sunday observance, Abp. Temple on, ii. 60-63
 Sunday opening of Museums, Abp. Temple on, ii. 163
 Sunday Schools, i. 604
 Sutton, Abp., ii. 211
 Sutherst, T., ii. 126
 Tait, Abp., and Abp. Temple at Oxford, i. 50, 64, 65, 76, 80, 89; Abp. Temple's appointment as Headmaster of Rugby, 151, 152, 153; 185, 186; letter to Abp. Temple on appointment to Exeter, 275-276; 295, 571, 592, 593; ii. 4, 265, 269, 415, 462, 466-589, 617, 619, 623
 Tait, *Life of Archbishop*, ii. 612, 618, 619 *note*¹
 Talbot, Bp., of Rochester, ii. 329
 Tatham, Prebendary, i. 380, 381
 Taunton, Lord, i. 133, 136 *note*¹
 Technical Instruction, *see* Education
 Temperance—Abp. Temple's conversion to Total Abstinence, i. 476-477; work at Exeter, 478 *et seq.*; United Kingdom Alliance Meeting, 479-481;

- Church of England Temperance Society, 482 *et seq.*, ii. 134, 135, 136, 222; National Temperance League, i. 484; Ancient Order of Rechabites, 484-485; Exeter Hall speech, 133-134; speech at Hampton-on-Thames, 137; appeal on behalf of children, 133-140; intemperance among women, 140-141; speech to the Cambridge Union, 322-329; Liquor Licensing Laws, Royal Commission on, Speech in House of Lords, 358-359; Sale of Intoxicating Liquors to Children Bill—speech in House of Lords, ii. 361; Public Houses (Scotland) Bill—speech in House of Lords, 361; Licensing Bill, 1902—speech in House of Lords, 361
- Temple, Anne (aunt of Abp. Temple), *see* Powlett, Mrs. Charles
- Temple, Anne Laura, *see* Thorold, Mrs.
- Temple, Catherine (sister of Abp. Temple), *see* Moberly, Mrs.
- Temple, Admiral Francis (uncle of Abp. Temple), i. 11
- Temple, Mrs. Francis, *née* Warren, i. 11 *note*³
- Temple, Frank (brother of Abp. Temple), i. 16
- Temple, Frederick, Archbishop of Canterbury, vol. i.

EARLIER YEARS (1821-1839) :—

Birth and ancestry, i. 3 *et seq.*; life in the Ionian Islands, 16-22; early education by his mother, 17-20; early recollections of, 19, 20; his father's influence on, 21; comes to England, 23, 24; life at Axon, 24-28; incident of the bag of nails, 25; enters Blundell's School, 29; confirmation, 30; life at Blundell's School, 29-36; friendship with Robert Lawson, 34; course of study at Blundell's School, 35; awarded a Blundell Scholarship, 36-38

OXFORD (1839-1848) :—

Enters Balliol, 39; Wins Powell prize, 39; second for Ireland Scholarship, 39-40; political views, 40-41; Oxford Movement, 41-43, 51, 55, 56, 64-68; Professor Jowett's recollections of, 43-45; Dr. Scott's letter to Lord Selborne, 46-47; vacations, 47-48; Dr. Jenkyns, 48-49; personal expenditure, 49-50; W. G. Ward, 50-51; Arthur Clough, 52, 53; Foreign Missions, 54, 55; mathematical and scientific powers, 58-62; double first class, 63; College Lecturer, 63; Junior Dean, 63; Ordination, 63; Tract XC., 64; offer of Mastership at Rugby, 65; letters to his mother, 68-70; projected essay on St. Thomas Aquinas, 70-71; educational spirit, 71-75; Edward Hobhouse, 74; University Reform, 75, 76; friends at Oxford, 77-81; memorandum by C. S. Roundell, 82-83; Sir W. J. Farrer's reminiscences, 83-86; Dr. Hornby's reminiscences, 86-93

EDUCATION OFFICE PERIOD (1848-1857) :—

Examiner in the Education Office, 97-98; Principal of Kneller Hall, 100; work at Kneller Hall, 101-113; letter of a former student at Kneller Hall, 109-112; domestic life at Kneller Hall, 112-113; Inspector of Training Colleges, 113-114; University Reform, 115-119; Oxford University Commission (1850), 115; recommendations as to Fellowships, 115-118; Studentships, 118-119; Students' Aid Society, 119; essay on National Education, 120; evidence before the Popular Education Commission (1860), 120-128; University Local Examinations, 129-132; Schools Inquiry Commission

Temple, Frederick, vol. i. (*cont.*):—

o (1864), 133-147; views on Secondary Education, 137-140, 146; religious instruction in Endowed Schools, 140; secular instruction, 141; Girls' Schools, 142; Grammar Schools, 142-144; Endowed Schools Bill, No. 2, 144-146

RUGBY (1857-1869):—

Elected Headmaster, i. 151-152; testimonials, 152-153; condition of Rugby School at time of appointment, 153-155; H. Lea Warner's reminiscences, 157-159, 160-162; first day at Rugby, 158; tree-climbing propensities, 159; teaching powers, 160-168; H. G. Hart's reminiscences, 163-165; views on Classical Education, 168-170; B. E. Hammond on Abp. Temple's teaching, 166; Rev. Arthur Butler on, 167; Archdeacon Sandford on, 167-168; recollections of masters, 171-183; (Rev. Arthur Butler, 172-175; Dr. Jex Blake, 175-177; Canon Scott Holland, 177-178; E. A. Scott, 178); Masters' meetings, 170-182; Public Schools Commission (1861), 184-187; reforms at Rugby, 187-195; staff of masters, 187; salaries, 188-189; lack of class-rooms, 189-190; new buildings, 190; Abp. Temple's plea for non-interference with Headmasters, 191-193; proposals as to Foundationers, 193-195; enlargement of curriculum, 196-199; Mr. Otto Goldschmidt's memorandum on musical training at Rugby, 200-202; rearrangement of Forms, 203-204; Mr. Arthur Sidgwick on Rugby (*New Quarterly Magazine*), 205-206; school games, 207-214; sermons and spiritual teaching, 215-219; *Essays and Reviews* in relation to the School, 219-

226; Bishop Percival's recollections, 221-225; home life at Rugby, 227-234; Abp. Temple's mother, 231-232; Miss Temple, 232-234; offer of Deanery of Durham, 235; offer of Bishopric of Exeter, 236; Abp. Temple's leave-taking, 237-241; subsequent connexion with the school, 241-243; *Good Friday*, a Rugby Sermon, 244-250

EXETER (1869-1885):—

Appointment to Exeter, 275; letters of congratulation, 275 *et seq.*; opposition on account of *Essays and Reviews*, 279 *et seq.*; Abp. Benson's letter to *The Times*, 287-288; election at Exeter, 289-292; Confirmation, 291; Consecration, 294-298; Enthronement, 298-299; statement in Convocation as to *Essays and Reviews*, 302-305; condition of diocese at Abp. Temple's appointment, 307-310; first tour, 311-319; visit to Blundell's School, 320; Plymouth, 324-326; Friendly Societies, 326-328; educational work, 329-349; advocacy of the principles of self-government, 350-352; organisation of Rural Deaneries, 352-356; Lay Conferences, 356-360; Archdeacons' meetings, 361-363; formation and objects of Diocesan Conferences, 363-366; speech at inaugural Conference, 366-369; General Committee of Religious Instruction formed, 369-370; work and residence in Cornwall, 382-385; Ordination sermon at Truro, 385-389; first efforts to revive the Cornish Bishopric, 391; assistance of the Diocesan Conference, 391-392; deputation to Mr. Disraeli, 393; Lady Rolle's gift, 395; Bill for the Revival of the Cornish See, 396-397; appointment of Abp. Benson to See of Truro, 399;

Temple, Frederick, vol. i. (*cont.*):—
 consecration and enthronement, 400-403; Abp. Temple's attitude towards the clergy, 404-407; first Ordination sermons, 407-409; Theological Colleges, 410-413; Bishop Phillpotts' Studentships, 413; examinations and preparation for Ordination, 413-423; Ordinations at different centres, 423; Church Patronage, 424-428; Pluralities Act Amendment Act, 428-429; Ruridecanal Conferences and Visitation Charges, 430-442; Quiet Days, 442-448; personal relations with the Clergy, 448-449, 459-466; aptitude for legal questions, 449-450; relations with Nonconformists, 451-455; consecration of cemeteries, 455; joint examinations of Board Schools in religious knowledge, 456; admission of a Roman Catholic into the Church of England, 456; Baptism, 457; Marriage, 458; Burial of infidels, 459; presentation of Pastoral Staff, 466-469; letter to Canon Lawson, 470-471; interest in municipal affairs, 471; West of England Bank failure, 472-473; Franco-German War, 473; interest in soldiers and sailors, 473-474; Temperance, 476 *et seq.*; United Kingdom Alliance meeting, 478-481; Purity, 485; Marriage with Deceased Wife's Sister Bill, 486-489; Young Men's Friendly Society, 489; Semper Fidelis Society, 489-490; Church Extension in the Three Towns, 491-500; Plymouth Mission, 500-501; Priesthood of the Laity, 501-503, 504-505; Parochial Councils, 503-504; restoration of Exeter Palace and Chapel, 507-513; Miss Temple, 513-518; Abp. Temple's marriage, 519-520; restoration of Exeter

Cathedral, 521-526; Reredos Case, 526-534; Abp. Temple and the Chapter, 534-547; sermon, 547-549; amalgamation of city parishes, 550-552; Tiverton parochial system, 553-554; early views on Convocation, 556-557; Abp. Temple's reception in Convocation, 557-558; Athanasian Creed, 558-559; Ecclesiastical Courts, 559-563; Ornaments Rubric, 563; Bishop's discretionary power, 564; expenses of litigation, 565; Pluralities Act Amendment Act, 566; evangelistic work of the Church, 567-568; authorised Hymnal, 568-569; Manual of Family Prayer, 569-571; Rogation Days, 571; Agenda paper for Convocation, 572-573; translation to London—reception by Convocation, 573-575; Abp. Temple in the House of Lords, 575-576; Pluralities Act Amendment Act, 576; Truro Bishopric Act, 576; Church Patronage, 576; Speech on National Education, 576-577; University Test Bill, 578-579; opening Churchyards to Nonconformists, 579; Marriage with Deceased Wife's Sister Bill, 580-581; relations with Public School and Universities, 581-582; Bampton Lectures, 582-584; Ordinations, 585-586; Confirmations, 586; Church building and restoration, 587; Foreign Missions, 587-588; Ritualism, 588-592; offer of See of London, 592-596; addresses from the clergy, 597; public testimonial, 598-600; close of the episcopate, 600-603; return visits to Exeter, 603-611

Temple, Frederick, Vol. ii.

LONDON (1885-1896):—

Appointment to See of London, 5; official signature, 6;

Temple, Frederick, vol. ii. (*cont.*):—enthronement, 7; letter to Rural Deans, 8; first Conference, 9; address on Religious equality, 9-10; Apostolical Succession, 10-11; Church "Patronage, 11-13; breaking ground in London, 14-15; relations with clergy, 15-21; sympathy with the blind, 21-22, 34-37; Bishop Walsham How, 23-27; Bishop Earle, 27; East London Church Festival, 28-30; parochial organisation, 30; exercise of patronage, 31-34; examinations for Holy Orders, 37; organisation of Lay Work, 38-42; deaconesses, 42-43; Kilburn Sisterhood, 43; Diocesan Church Reading Union, 43-46; Rural Deaneries, 47; on Baptism, 47-48; on Holy Orders, 48; on the history and practice of the Church of England, 49; on Church Services, 49; on Sermons, 50; on the prevalent ignorance of the Bible, 50; on Church Choirs, 51; on the Church and London Poor, 52; on the growth of London, 53; on the Lincoln Judgment, 54-58; Foreign Missions, 59; on Scepticism, 59-60; on Sunday observance, 60-62; Church Reform, 64; "Union with Christ" (sermon), 64; on Christian Doctrine and Christian Life, 65-67; on Evolution, 67-69; on the study of Church History, 69-70; on Faith, 70-72; Teaching University for London, 73-80; Royal Commission on Education, 80-81; elementary education, 81-82; on religious teaching, 82; on Morality and Religion, 82-84; on Home Influence, 84-86; on the religious character of the teacher, 86; on the use and abuse of tests, 86-89; State aid *v.* Rate aid, 90; Education Bill, 1896,

90; lecture on "Conscience and the Bible," 91; Holy Scripture, 91-94; address to Lay Helpers, 94-99; ecclesiastical prosecutions, 100-103; Confession, 104-106; Eucharistic doctrine, 106; commemorating the dead, 108-111; re-marriage of divorced persons, 111-112; ritualism, 112; St. Paul's Reredos case, 113-117; Dr. Momerie, 117-118; Rev. H. R. Haweis, 119-122; social problems, 123 *et seq.*; anecdotes, 124-125; Anti-sweating League, 126; poor relief, 127; *Pall Mall Gazette* revelations, 128-129; Church and Stage Guild, 129-130; rescue work, 131; clergy and party politics, 131-133; temperance speeches, 133-140; intemperance amongst women, 140-141; "Our Social Manners and Customs," 141-142; Dockers' Strike, 142-150; Bishop's Park, Fulham, 150-151; popularity with the poor, 151-152; work in Convocation, 153 *et seq.*; Church Reform, 154; polygamy amongst the Heathen, 154; Queen Anne's Bounty, 154-156; Deacons Bill, 156; Marriage Act Amendment Act, 157-158; betting and gambling, 158-159; Education Bill (1890), 159-160; Clergy Discipline Act, 160; Uniformity Act Amendment Act, 160-162; Church Patronage Bill, 162; Voluntary Schools, 163; presentation of pastoral staff, 165-168; Welsh Church, 168-169; Church Endowments, 169-172; return of Bradford Manuscript to the United States, 172-175; Abp. Temple and the House of Lords, 176-177; photographs of Abp. Temple, 177-178; Confirmation addresses, 178; anecdotes, 179-180; death of Abp. Benson, 180; appointment to

Temple, Frederick, vol. ii. (*cont.*):—
the Primacy, 181; *Morning Post* on the appointment, 182; farewell to London, 182-183; sermon, 183-184; presentations, 184-185; Guildhall meeting, 185-187; speech, 187-190; close of the episcopate, 190-191; proposed Gresham University, 196-204; religious endowments, 204-205

CANTERBURY (1896-1902):—

Translation to Canterbury, 210; reception in Canterbury, 210; sale of Addington Park, 211-213; rebuilding of the Old Palace, Canterbury, 213, 216; Conferences, 217-218; Temperance work, 219-222; Education, 223-225; Foreign Missions, 225-228; work in the diocese, 228-230; typhoid epidemic at Maidstone, 230-231; King's School, Canterbury, 233-235; citizenship, 235-236; the last year, 236-238; final visitation, meetings and sermon, 238-241; the last days, 241-242

THE PRIMACY (1896-1902):—

Letter from Lord Salisbury offering the Primacy, 245; Abp. Temple's letter of acceptance, 246; Abp. Temple as Abp. Benson's adviser, 247-248; protest against Abp. Temple's confirmation, 253; Bishop Gore's consecration, 254; Abp. Temple's enthronement, 255-257; reception by the Corporation of Canterbury, 258; speech on day of Enthronement, 259; Bull *Apostolicae Curae*, and the *Responsio*, 260-262; sale of Addington and restoration of the Old Palace, 262-264; expenditure on Lambeth Palace, 264; transfer of playing field at Lambeth to the London County Council, 265-266; Diamond Jubilee, 267-268; Lambeth Conference, 268 *et seq.*; visit to Ebbs Fleet, 269;

Abp. Temple as chairman of the Conference, 271-272; gift from the American Bishops, 272-273; Encyclical Letter, 273-275; Dismissal service, 275; Abp. Temple's sermon, 275-276; Foreign Missions, 276; anecdotes, 277-279; visit to Glastonbury, 279-280; visit to the General Assembly, Scotland, 281 *et seq.*; Abp. Temple's address, 283; Threefold Option Alliance, 286-288; visit to Perth, 288-289; Sir William Harcourt's letters to *The Times* on the growth of Ritualism, 290; primary Visitation Charge, 290-291; total abstainers and the Holy Communion, 291-292; on the use of wafer bread, 292-293; re-marriage of divorced persons, 293-294; on the preface to the Prayer-Book, 294; opinion of the Archbishops on Incense, 296 *et seq.*; Processional lights, 301; protest against the opinion of the Archbishops, 302; Abp. Temple's reply, 302-304; reservation of the Sacrament, 304-308; Nottingham Church Congress, 309-310; Bradford Church Congress, 310-312; Durham Church Congress, 313-314; Brighton Church Congress, 314-315; Benefices Bill, 315-316; England and the Welsh Church, 316-317; visit to St. Asaph, 317; Christ's Hospital Sermon, 317-318; St. Gabriel's Training College, 318; Sheffield Grammar School, 319; visit to Bristol, 320; visit to Norwich, 321; visit to Wakefield, 321; Cambridge Union, 322; re-opening of Salisbury Cathedral, 323; Abp. Temple in Convocation, 325 *et seq.*; reception as Archbishop, 326; Reform of Convocation, 327-330; Hearing of cases of doubt,

Temple, Frederick, vol. ii (*cont.*):—

330-332; Benefices Bill, 332; Unauthorised services, 332-334; Parochial Councils, 334; Revised Version, 334-335; Sunday editions of newspapers, 335-337; Voluntary Schools, 337-341; candidates for Holy Orders, 341; Dilapidations, 342; authorisation by Royal Warrant, 342-343; Marriage with Deceased Wife's Sister, 343-344; death of Abp. Temple, 344; House of Lords, 345 *et seq.*; Contagious Diseases, 345; Sunday Bill, 346; Suffragan Bishops Bill, 347; Education, 348-352; Benefices Bill, 352; Irregularities in Public Worship, 353; Prayers for the Dead, 356; Temperance, 358; Marriage Act Amendment Act, 361; Burial Grounds Bill, 362; Sovereign's Declaration, 362; sermon on Queen Victoria's eightieth birthday, 365; death of Queen Victoria—speech in House of Lords, 366-367; sermon at St. Paul's, 368; sermon at St. Botolph's, Aldersgate, 369; sermon at Croydon, 370; Coronation of King Edward the Seventh, 370-374; Victorian Order conferred on Abp. Temple, 374; last engagements, 375 *et seq.*; last speech in House of Lords, 380 *et seq.*; Abp. Davidson's communication to the House of Lords, 383; the end, 384; the funeral, 385-387; the grave, 387

SUPPLEMENTAL:—

Abp. Temple's character as shown in his letters, 401 *et seq.*; schooldays, 402-408; Oxford, 408 *et seq.*; Dr. Jenkyns, 410-413; friendships at Oxford, 413 *et seq.*; growth of views, political, philosophical, literary, 410 *et seq.*; Ireland Scholarship and Degree, 427 *et seq.*; Oxford Movement,

434 *et seq.*; W. G. Ward, 439 *et seq.*; J. H. Newman, 441 *et seq.*; Dr. Pusey, 442 *et seq.*; death of a college friend, 449-451; growth of controversy, 451 *et seq.*; devotional study and practical religious duties, 457; Tract XC., 458; Bishop Selwyn and Dr. Arnold at Oxford, 461-462; offer of a Rugby Mastership, 462 *et seq.*; Mr. Jelf's letter to Mrs. Temple, 468; Abp. Temple's letters to his mother, 449 *et seq.*; Ward's deprivation and secession, 476 *et seq.*; Oxford and Cambridge Local Examinations, 540 *et seq.*; politics, 555 *et seq.*; Kneller Hall, 563 *et seq.*; Headmaster of Rugby, 588-603; death of Mrs. Temple, 603-604; *Essays and Reviews*, 604-622; Dr. Hayman's appointment, 624-627; *Essays and Reviews*, 628 *et seq.*; Bampton Lectures, 633 *et seq.*; education, 648 *et seq.*; care of the Faith, the Church, national life, 656 *et seq.*; matured character, 658 *et seq.*; home life in old age, 677 *et seq.*; correspondence with his son, 678-703; anecdotes, 704-708; daily service in Canterbury Cathedral, 710; the end, 711-712

Temple, Frederick (uncle of Abp. Temple), *ibid.* 7 note⁴, 11

Temple, Frederick Charles (son of Abp. Temple), *ibid.* 61, 520

Temple, George (great-great-grandfather of Abp. Temple), *ibid.* 41

Temple, Jennetta Octavia (sister of Abp. Temple), *ibid.* 5, 16, 21, 23, 43, 47, 50, 156, 179; life at Rugby, 232-234; reminiscences of, 513-519; Abp.

*Temple's letters to, *ibid.* 402, 403, 410, 421, 438, 447, 453, 583, 642

Temple, Colonel John (brother of Abp. Temple), *ibid.* 16, 17,

- 29-39, 513; death of, ii. 602
- Temple, John (nephew of Abp. Temple), ii. 624
- Temple, John James (uncle of Abp. Temple), i. 7 *note*⁴, 11
- Temple, Laura (aunt of Abp. Temple), i. 7 *note*⁴
- Temple, Sir Leofric, Bart., i. 12 *note*¹
- Temple, Margaret Stow (sister of Abp. Temple), *see* Hugo, Mrs.
- Temple, Mrs. (mother of Abp. Temple), marriage of, i. 4; 12; ancestry of, 13; engagement and marriage, 13, 14; enters Abp. Temple's birth in the Probus registry, 14, 15; education of her children, 17-20; residence in Oxford, 63; Abp. Temple's daily correspondence with, 68 *note*¹; goes to Rugby, 156; Dr. Jex Blake's reminiscences of, 176; death, 231, ii. 602-603; life at Rugby, i. 232; letter to Abp. Temple, ii. 464
- Letters to, from Abp. Temple, i. 68, 69, 70; ii. 402, 403, 404, 405, 406, 409, 410, 411, 412, 413, 414, 415, 416, 417, 418, 420, 421, 424, 425, 426, 427, 428, 429, 430, 432, 436, 437, 438, 439, 440, 441, 442, 444, 446, 447, 448, 449, 451, 453, 454, 455, 456, 457, 458, 459, 460, 461, 465, 466, 468, 469, 473, 475, 477, 490, 657
- Temple, Mrs. (wife of Abp. Temple), marriage of, i. 519; life at Exeter, 520-521; Abp. Temple's engagement books, ii. 14; letters from Abp. Benson, 20, 65; at Fulham, 37; presentations to (London), 184-185, 186; at Canterbury, 231; illness of, 238; Abp. Temple's last illness, 242; park at Lambeth, 266
- Temple, Major Octavius (father of Abp. Temple), birth, i. 3; enters the army, 3, 4; resident in the Ionian Islands, 4; purchases Axon, 4, 23; Lieutenant-Governor of Sierra Leone, 4; marriage, 4; character of, 4-6, 21; 29
- Temple, Robert George (uncle of Abp. Temple), i. 7 *note*⁴
- Temple, William (great-grandfather of Abp. Temple), i. 11
- Temple, William (son of Abp. Temple), i. 520
- Letters to, from Abp. Temple, ii. 405, 678, 679-680, 681, 682, 683, 684, 685, 686, 688, 689, 690, 691, 692, 693, 694, 695, 697, 698, 699, 700, 701, 702, 703
- Temple, Sir William, i. 12 *note*¹
- Temple, Rev. William Johnston (grandfather of Abp. Temple), birth of, i. 6; at Edinburgh University, 6; friendship with James Boswell, 6, 9-11; ordination of, 7; rector of Mamhead, 7; marriage of, 7; vicar of St. Gluvias, 7; character of, 8-10; literary work of, 10; death, 11
- Temple, Mrs. W. J., *née* Stow (grandmother of Abp. Temple), i. 7, 10, 11
- Temple, William Octavius (brother of Abp. Temple), i. 16, 112
- Tennyson, Lord, i. 76, 109
- Testimonial to Abp. Temple on leaving Exeter, i. 599
- Tests, use and abuse of, Abp. Temple on, ii. 86-89
- The New Primæ*, poem in *The Spectator*, ii. 194-195
- Thirlwall, Bp., of St. David's, i. 296
- Thompson, W. H., i. 176
- Thomson, Sir Robert White, i. 469
- Thornton, Archdeacon, of Middlesex, ii. 31
- Thorold, Bp., of Winchester, i. 134; ii. 54 *note*¹
- Thorold, Mrs., *née* Temple (sister of Abp. Temple), i. 16, 63, 119
- Threefold Option Alliance, Abp. Temple's address to (1898), ii. 286-287
- Three Lectures: The Practice of Education*, i. 183 *note*¹
- Three Towns, Abp. Temple's work in, i. 496-499

- Three Towns Church Extension Society, i. 492 *et seq.*
- Tillett, B., and the Dockers' Strike, ii. 143, 144, 145
- Times, The*, i. 287, 558; ii. 119, 290
- Tindall, Canon, reminiscence of Abp. Temple, ii. 231
- Tiverton, Bill for improving the ecclesiastical condition of, i. 553-554
- Tom Brown's School-Days*, i. 208, 229
- Torrance, A. M., ii. 266
- Tozer, Bishop, ii. 24
- T.P.'s Weekly*, ii. 6 *note*³
- Tract XC.*, ii. 458
- Tractarian Movement, *see* Oxford Movement
- Tracts for the Times*, i. 42, 44 *et seq.*
- Training Colleges, Abp. Temple as Inspector of, ii. 582
- Trelawny, Bp., of Exeter, i. 267
- Tristram, Dr., ii. 174
- Trower, Bp., i. 291
- Truro Bishopric, revival of, *see* Cornish See, revival of
- Truro Bishopric Act, i. 576
- Truro Chapter Act, i. 576
- Truro Diocesan Kalendar*, i. 376 *note*¹
- Truro Training College, i. 365
- Turner, Bp., of Islington, ii. 37
- Twiss, Sir Travers, i. 292
- Tyacke, Rev. R., i. 384
- Unemployed, Abp. Temple on (1895), ii. 126-127
- Union of Benefices Bill, ii. 162
- Union of Small Parishes in Exeter, i. 550-552, 576
- United Kingdom Alliance, uproarious meeting at Exeter (1872), i. 479-481
- Universities Inquiry Commission (1850), i. 49
- University Reform, Abp. Temple and, i. 71, 75, 76, 115-119, 320; ii. 484, 534, 535
- University Test Bill, Abp. Temple's speech in the House of Lords (1870), i. 578-579
- "Use of Lectures, The," Abp. Temple's inaugural address to the Diocesan Church Reading Union (1901), ii. 43-46
- Vaughan, Dean, of Llandaff, ii. 118
- Vaughan, Henry Halford, i. 176
- Vaughan, Major-General John, i. 7 *note*¹
- Vecqueray, J. W. J., i. 171
- Venn, Rev. H., i. 554
- Vestments, Abp. Temple's speech on, in Convocation (1879), i. 563
- Victoria, Queen, ii. 246; death of, Abp. Temple's speech in House of Lords (1901), 366-367; sermon at St. Paul's, 368-369; St. Botolph's, Aldersgate, 369; Croydon, 370
- Victorian Order conferred on Abp. Temple, ii. 374
- Vindication*, Cardinal Vaughan's (Bull *Apostolicæ Curæ*), ii. 262
- Visitation Charges, i. 425-430, 434-441, 501-505; ii. 65, 238, 260
- Voluntary Schools, *see* Education
- Voluntary Schools Bill, Abp. Temple's speech in House of Lords (1897), ii. 348-349
- Wace, Dean, of Canterbury, ii. 76
- Wakefield, Abp. Temple's visit to, (1901), ii. 321
- Walker, Dr., i. 380
- Walrond, Theodore, Abp. Temple's intimacy with, i. 80, 113
- Walsh, Mrs., letter to, from Abp. Temple, ii. 215
- Warelwast, Bp., of Exeter, i. 256
- Ward, Bp. Seth, i. 267, 508, 522
- Ward, W. G., i. 42 *note*¹, 44, 50, 51, 53, 55, 63, 64, 66, 77, 89; ii. 70, 416, 439, 444, 446, 461, 476, 479-484, 486
- Ward, W. G., Condemnation of, *supra*
- Warre, Dr., i. 11 *note*⁴
- Warren, Susan, *see* Temple, Mrs. Francis
- Wedgwood, Hensleigh, i. 197
- Weisse, H. E., i. 194 *note*¹
- Welldon, Bishop, reminiscences of Abp. Temple, ii. 37, 59 *note*¹, 178
- Wellesley, Dean, on Abp. Temple's appointment to Exeter, i. 289, 290, 301
- Wellington, Duke of, i. 309; ii. 560
- Wellington, Life of*, ii. 560

- Welsh, Abp. Temple's sympathy with the, ii. 168
- Welsh Church, Duty of England to—speech by Abp. Temple, ii. 316
- Welsh Disestablishment Bill, ii. 162; Albert Hall meeting, 168
- Were, Bp., of Derby, letter to, from Abp. Temple, ii. 599
- Wesley, John, i. 268, 269, 378, 383, 390, 509, 517, 588; ii. 441
- Wesley, John, Life and Times of*, i. 268 note¹, 269 note^{1,2,3}
- West Briton and Cornwall Advertiser*, i. 388 note¹
- West of England Bank failure (1878), i. 472-473
- Westcott, Bp., of Durham, i. 594; ii. 305
- Western Morning News*, i. 323
- Weston, Bishop, i. 509
- Whigham, Rev. L. R., reminiscences of Abp. Temple, i. 209 note¹, 232 note¹, 423 note¹, 465
- White, Edward, ii. 119
- Whitehead, Sir James, and the Dockers' Strike, ii. 143, 146, 147, 148, 149
- Whitworth, Prebendary, reminiscence of Abp. Temple, ii. 179 note¹
- Wilberforce, Ernest Roland, Bp. of Chichester, ii. 344
- Wilberforce, Robert, Archdeacon of East Riding, i. 52
- Wilberforce, Samuel, Bp. of Oxford, ordains Abp. Temple priest, i. 63; letter to Abp. Temple on appointment to Exeter, 277; *Essays and Reviews*, 282-283; 406; ii. 484
- Wilkinson, Archdeacon, of Totnes, memorandum on Abp. Temple's work at Plymouth, i. 492 note¹, 494, 500 note¹
- Wilkinson, Bp., of Taro, ii. 288
- Williams, Dr. Rowland, ii. 613
- Wilson, Rev. H. B., ii. 613
- Wilson, Ven. J. M., Archdeacon of Manchester, memoranda dictated by Miss Temple to, i. 5 note¹, 16; text-book of Geometry, 141 note¹; at Rugby, 171, 178 note², 181, 198, 225 note¹
- Wilson, W. Knayvett, i. 226
- Windsor, Lord, ii. 364
- Winnock, Rev. G., i. 14
- Wise, H. C., i. 151 note¹
- Woolcombe, Archdeacon, i. 78, 154, 155, 362, 414
- Wordsworth, Bp., of Lincoln, correspondence with Abp. Temple on *Essays and Reviews*, i. 292-294; 295
- Wordsworth, Bp., of St. Andrews, ii. 288
- Wordsworth, Bp., of Salisbury, ii. 54 note¹, 261, 289, 332; memorandum on Abp. Temple and the *Responsio* to the Bull *Apostolicæ Curæ*, 388-397
- Working Men's Meeting (Nottingham), speech by Abp. Temple, ii. 310
- Worship, Improper objects of, Abp. Temple on, ii. 291
- Wright, Mr. Justice, i. 134 note²
- Young Men's Friendly Society, i. 489

THE END

